82 01228

BECA-0136

HOUSING NEEDS REPORT

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

no slip

prepared by

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Approved by the Executive Board
for Local Government Review

DECEMBER 1981

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JAN 22 1982

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Regional

ABAG ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Hotel Claremont • Berkeley, California 94705 • 415/841-9730

8201228

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS
EXECUTIVE BOARD RESOLUTION 4-81
HOUSING NEEDS DETERMINATIONS

WHEREAS, the Association is a council of governments under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act; and

WHEREAS, each council of governments is required by Section 65584 of the Government Code, as added by Chapter 1143, Statutes of 1980 (hereinafter "Section 65584"), to determine the existing and projected housing needs for its region; and

WHEREAS, the Association is further required to determine each city's and each county's share of the regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Association's staff has prepared and circulated, for public review and comment, a draft Housing Needs Report that is a determination meeting the requirements of Section 65584; and

WHEREAS, after a duly noticed public hearing held on December 17, 1981, the Executive Board has considered the proposed Housing Needs Report and comments thereon; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Board finds such report includes consideration of all factors listed in Section 65584 in proposing the initial determination of regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Board desires that local governments be given the maximum time to review the report as part of the official 90-day period specified in Section 65584, and to revise shares of the regional housing needs as allowed by law; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Board believes that local review and revision of the report should take place in a well-organized fashion; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Board further believes that a brief period of time should be allowed to ensure receipt of the report by local governments during the holiday season; and

WHEREAS, to coordinate and preserve the maximum time for

review of local housing needs shares, the Association has prepared model resolutions for use by local governments in approving or revising their housing needs shares; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Control on August 19, 1981 found that the activities cited above were mandated by the State and that the State is required to reimburse the Association for the costs of complying with such mandate; and

WHEREAS, on October 21, 1981, the Board of Control adopted guidelines that require the Association's initial housing needs determinations be completed by December 31, 1981, as a condition for full reimbursement; and

WHEREAS, response to these requirements has been difficult and the abbreviated time period in the guidelines prevents more than token public participation and consultation with affected parties prior to the Association's taking the initial action required under Section 65584;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Housing Needs Report is approved for the purpose of beginning the official review and revision of the determinations contained therein; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this action is effective December 31, 1981, thereby providing for local government review through March 1982; and be it further

RESOLVED, that staff of Bay Area cities and counties are requested to work with the Association's staff in the review and revision process to ensure the most complete and reliable information is used in the determination of housing needs for the region and each city and county; and be it further

RESOLVED, that, pursuant to Section 65584, cities and counties are requested to make modifications to their shares of the region's housing needs effective on March 31, 1982, in order that the Executive Board may act on the revisions, as required by law, in a considered, coordinated fashion; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Association's staff is directed to prepare a brief report on each local government housing needs revision and to prepare all other required documents prior to the Executive Board's final action on the housing needs determinations during 1982.

The foregoing was adopted by the Executive Board this 17th day of December, 1981, effective on the 31st of December, 1981.

Attest:

Revan A.F. Tranter
Secretary-Treasurer

Signed:

Susanne Wilson
President

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/c124892851

HOUSING NEEDS REPORT

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

prepared by

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Approved by the Executive Board
for Local Government Review

DECEMBER 1981

© Association of Bay Area Governments 1981

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

The numbers contained herein will change as a result of the local government review of the document, which is mandated by Section 65584 of the Government Code, as added by enactment of Chapter 1143 (AB 2853), Statutes of 1980. Therefore, prior to May 30, 1982, the numbers cited are only the initial and **not the final determinations** required by Section 65584 of the Government Code.

HOUSING NEEDS REPORT
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. Introduction..... 1

2. Summary of Major Findings..... 3
   Tables A-1 and A-2..... 5

3. Local Government Review Process..... 7

   Initial Determinations Phase..... 7

   Local Review and Revision Phase..... 7

   ABAG Action on Local Revisions Phase..... 7

   Criteria for Review Process..... 8

   Local Government Action..... 11
   Model Resolution 1..... 12
   Model Resolution 2..... 14

4. Local Housing Needs Determinations..... 17

   Existing Housing Need..... 17
   Tables B-1 to B-10..... 18

   Projected Housing Need..... 28
   Tables C-1 to C-10..... 29

   Consideration of Tenure of Housing..... 39
   Tables D-1 to D-10..... 40

   Consideration of Income Levels..... 50
   Tables E-1 to E-10..... 51

   Farmworker Housing..... 61
   Table F-1..... 62

   Replacement of Existing Housing..... 63
   Tables G-1 to G-9..... 64

HOUSING NEEDS REPORT
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Appendices

I. Text of AB 2853 (Chapter 1143, Statutes of 1980)..... I-1

II. Background Paper on Legal Requirements of Regional Housing Needs Determinations..... II-1
Table II-1: Twenty Ranking Employment Centers in 1975..... II-4
Table II-2: Comparison of Housing Need Determination with State Estimate of Regional Housing Need..... II-18

III. Background Paper on Methodology..... III-1
Tables III-1 to III-9: 1980 Population and Housing, Cities and Counties..... III-35
Table III-10: Employment by County (1975-1985)..... III-44
Tables III-11 to III-20: Estimated Percentage Distribution of 1980 Housing by Type, Cities and Counties.. III-45
Tables III-21: 1980 Farmworker Employment by County..... III-55
Table III-22: Replacement Needs, Statewide Housing Plan Estimates..... III-56
Tables III-23 to III-32: 1985 Replacement Need, Cities and Counties..... III-57

IV. Background Paper on Related Regional Housing Programs..... IV-1

V. Acknowledgements..... V-1

1. INTRODUCTION

State legislation enacted in 1980 (Chapter 1143, Statutes of 1980; AB 2853) requires the Association of Bay Area Governments and other councils of governments (COGs) in California to determine existing and projected regional housing needs. A copy of this law is included in Appendix I. ABAG is also required by this legislation to determine city and county shares of the regional housing needs. The local shares of regional housing needs are to be considered in the development of city and county housing elements of local general plans.

Based on comments received at a public hearing on December 17, 1981, the ABAG Executive Board, by Resolution -81, accepted this report for distribution to cities and counties of the Bay Area. **This action means that ABAG has completed the initial determinations required of it under AB 2853, and that the 90-day official review period for cities and counties can begin.**

Under AB 2853, the 90-day period is provided for Bay Area cities and counties to consider these initial determinations of local shares of the regional housing needs. These shares may be revised by cities and counties. ABAG is required by subsection (c) of Section 65584 to accept each revision or "indicate, based on available data and accepted planning methodology, why the revision is inconsistent with the regional housing need." ABAG's acceptance or rejection of a local government's revision is to take place within 60 days of the revision. The local review process is more fully described in Chapter 3.

As noted above, the Executive Board's action, which was made effective December 31, 1981, begins the official period by which local governments may revise the determinations of housing needs contained in the report. The 90-day period ends March 31, 1982.

This report was prepared by ABAG staff. The methods used to calculate the regional and local housing needs were reviewed by the following advisory committees:

- Projections Technical Advisory Committee
- Housing Advisory Committee
- Regional Planning Committee.

The methods were designed by ABAG staff to meet the specific requirements of AB 2853. Certain calculations,

specific requirements of AB 2853. Certain calculations, because they are based on limited data, are very important in the analysis described. The assumptions are stated in the report. Local review of the data and the assumptions is important in determining whether a locality's share of the regional housing needs should be revised.

The Executive Board urges local government staff to work with ABAG staff during the official review process to complete the actions required in a timely fashion. The Executive Board must complete its action on the local revisions by May 30, as specified in Section 65584 of the Government Code.

Requests for further information about the content of the report should be directed to:

ABAG Housing Program
Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, CA 94705
(415) 841-9730.

2. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

By 1985 the housing supply of the San Francisco Bay Area should increase by about 216,900 units from the level of housing stock estimated as available for full-year occupancy in 1980. This is the "projected housing need" for the region. It would provide for the expected growth in the number of households in the region, and would also provide enough vacant units to begin to stabilize the housing market. The additional units would represent an addition of about 2% annually between 1980 and 1985. Addition of this number of units would raise the region's overall vacancy rate from about 3.4% in 1980 to 4% in 1985.

These summary statistics result from the accumulations of needs estimates calculated for each of the Bay Area's nine counties and 92 cities, as required by State law. Estimates were also calculated for the unincorporated area of each county and are shown in tables throughout the report. The analysis considered information on local market trends and land use constraints as well as overall regional housing needs and goals.

In 1975--used in this analysis as the **benchmark** for market indicators--4.7% of the region's housing supply was vacant and available for permanent year-round occupancy, for rent or for sale. By 1980 that rate had dropped to 3.4%--representing a decline in vacant housing of close to 18,000 units. As the region's population grew between 1975 and 1980, only 9 housing units were added for every 10 new households seeking shelter. To make up for that shrinkage in the supply, the analysis presented in this Housing Needs Report recommends that, by 1985, the region should add 11 dwellings for every 10 new households.

The two most important types of data used in determining the region's and each locality's housing needs were (1) household growth trends from 1975 to 1980 and projected growth from 1980 to 1985, and (2) the number of housing units estimated to be available for year-round permanent occupancy. Together these two types of data are responsible for the "available vacancy rate" measure, which is the driving element in calculating the 1980 and 1985 housing needs.

The appendices of the report describe the sources used in assembling the data and the methods by which they were used in the needs determinations. In reviewing the report, local governments are urged to focus on these two subject

matters to ensure that the best available data is used in this regional analysis.

Specifically, what proportion of the housing supply is in "second homes" or seasonal dwellings? Has that proportion changed over the past 5 to 10 years; is it expected to change between now and 1985? The household growth trends calculated for 1975 to 1980 and estimated for 1980 to 1985 were based on a combination of three sources of data: U.S. Census, Department of Finance and ABAG's Projections 79. Are the results presented here consistent with data collected by local governments in connection with their own planning studies?

Table A-1 summarizes the existing (1980) and projected (1985) housing need, with the 1985 figures representing the **increase** in available housing from the 1980 level. Table A-2 compares the projected increase in housing need with the projected growth in households estimated in Projections 79, adopted by ABAG's General Assembly in November 1979.

While the projections report was not adopted specifically as a "policy" document, it is used for planning and capital investment decisions (for example, as the basis for timing of the municipal wastewater facilities needs list included in the regional Environmental Management Plan), and hence has policy implications. Therefore, it is important to examine the housing needs projected in this report compared to existing projections of population and housing for the Bay Area. This is more fully discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 presents the existing and projected housing needs by city.

TABLE A-1
EXISTING (1980) AND PROJECTED (1985) HOUSING NEED
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION AND COUNTIES

County	1980 Households	1980 Available Housing	1980 Existing Housing Need	1980-85 Projected Household Increase	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Alameda	426,092	442,293	4,124	35,597	39,212
Contra Costa	241,805	250,460	1,783	39,812	42,756
Marin	88,983	90,712	1,378	6,289	7,516
Napa	36,624	38,770	240	4,469	4,687
San Francisco	298,957	312,809	5,428	7,307	12,042
San Mateo	225,479	231,978	1,592	12,071	13,142
Santa Clara	458,519	471,265	3,919	54,320	58,548
Solano	80,426	83,020	818	18,501	20,380
Sonoma	114,523	117,838	726	17,333	18,600
Region	1,971,408	2,039,145	20,008	195,699	216,883

TABLE A-2
COMPARISON OF HOUSING NEEDS WITH PROJECTIONS 79
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION AND COUNTIES

County	1980 Households (Census)	1980 Households (ABAG Projections 79)*	1980-85 Projected Household Increase (Proj. 79)	1980-85 Projected Household Increase (HNR)**	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed (HNR)
Alameda	426,092	422,559	35,302	35,597	39,212
Contra Costa	241,805	232,460	38,273	39,812	42,756
Marin	88,983	88,212	6,235	6,289	7,516
Napa	36,624	38,374	4,683	4,469	4,687
San Francisco	298,957	306,854	7,500	7,307	12,042
San Mateo	225,479	227,319	12,169	12,071	13,142
Santa Clara	458,519	447,336	52,995	54,320	58,548
Solano	80,426	82,448	18,962	18,501	20,380
Sonoma	114,523	108,545	16,428	17,333	18,600
Region	1,971,408	1,954,087	192,547	195,699	216,883

* Projections 79, ABAG, 1980.

** Housing Needs Report, ABAG, 1981.

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW PROCESS

Chapter 1143 of the Statutes of 1980 provides a three-step process for determining regional and local housing needs. These steps are:

- Initial determination of regional and local housing needs by ABAG.
- Local review and revisions of local housing needs.
- ABAG action on local revisions.

Initial Determinations Phase

This step was accomplished by Executive Board action on this report, which identifies the regional housing need, and local shares of such need, according to the factors required by law to be considered in making such determinations. The factors and how they were considered in making the determinations in this report are described in Appendices II and III.

Local Review and Revision Phase

Subsection (c) of Section 65584 of the Government Code provides that, within 90 days of the determinations made by this report, Bay Area cities and counties may revise the local shares of the regional housing needs using accepted planning methods and available data.

To give local goverments maximum review time, the Executive Board's resolution accepting this report makes the determinations effective December 31, 1981 (the deadline by which ABAG had to make the initial needs determinations to qualify for reimbursement of State-mandated costs).

ABAG Action on Local Revisions Phase

Subsection (c) further provides that, within 60 days of any local government action to revise the locality's share of regional housing needs, ABAG must accept the revision or indicate why the revision is inconsistent with regional housing need.

Criteria for Review Process

To guide local government review of the needs determinations, this section describes the criteria by which ABAG's Executive Board will review and accept local government revisions or, in accordance with law, indicate why such revisions are inconsistent with the regional housing needs.

Obviously, then, each local government's review of its share of the region's housing needs is an important component of the work required under AB 2853. Local government participation in deciding the region's housing need is essential in meeting the requirements of the law. The **final local government** shares of the region's housing need, as determined by ABAG or through the revision process, will result in the determination of local housing needs that **will have to be addressed in local government housing elements.**

The criteria for local government review of the regional housing need shares were developed because ABAG staff members were concerned that the housing element law be considered systematically throughout the Bay Area in way that provided, to the maximum practical extent, local government review of the shares of regional housing need in an organized manner. The housing element law does not provide criteria for accepting local government revisions. It only specifies that the revisions are to be based on "available data" and "accepted" planning methods, and fully documented. Accordingly, ABAG staff members believed it important that the Housing Needs Report describe, in advance, criteria under which the Executive Board would accept revisions to the local shares of the regional housing need by cities and counties in the Bay Area.

The overall regional housing need determined in this report is the benchmark for what the Bay Area as a whole should be producing to meet its housing needs. The **regional** need determination will not be raised or lowered in 1982 to reflect local governments' revisions of the shares of the regional housing needs. Instead, the determination of the region's housing need will be revised in 1983 under AB 2853, specifically in accordance with a requirement that local governments update their housing elements by July 1, 1984. This will permit an orderly reexamination of the regional housing need situation.

With the above in mind, this report contains five criteria for Executive Board review of any local government revisions to shares of the regional housing needs, and acceptance or rejection of such revisions:

1. ABAG has used Census figures, where available, and other available data in its calculations of regional housing needs. Use of available data is required by AB 2853. The data is necessarily limited, and ABAG staff have identified data sources in the report.

ABAG's Executive Board will accept revisions of the housing needs shares when a local government provides more current and reliable data as a substitute for the data used in the calculations described in this report.

An important example of this use of such data is in estimating the fraction of each jurisdiction's housing stock that was available for full-year occupancy in 1980 (stock not available includes second homes, units awaiting demolition, and migrant and seasonal housing). The estimates in this report were made, as explained previously, using the proportion of such stock that was available for full-year occupancy in 1970 (as estimated by the 1970 Census) and applying it to the 1980 housing stock.

In other words, if 99.5% of a jurisdiction's housing stock was available for full-year occupancy in 1970, ABAG has assumed that 99.5% of the 1980 housing stock was available. In fact, a higher proportion might have been available, but 1980 Census data that would show this has not yet been released. Local governments may have unique information that would result in changes in the estimates of 1980 available housing stock. More current and reliable data could be substituted elsewhere in the calculations presented in this report.

2. The availability of suitable sites and facilities is required to be considered in the distribution of regional housing needs to communities within the region. ABAG staff has used the availability-of-sites information collected in 1975-76 in the local development policy survey and assumed in Projections 79. As previously stated, Projections 79 was adopted by ABAG's General Assembly in November 1979 after six months' review by cities and counties and other affected agencies. Since the local policy survey was conducted, it is likely that local policies have changed. Nevertheless, these regional projections are used in capital investment decisions for transportation, and the approved projections are by Federal and State law used in determining grant-eligible capacity for wastewater treatment projects.

After consultation with local governments, ABAG's Executive Board will use updated information on local development policy changes that would affect the

household growth increments for 1980 to 1985, and hence the determination of the 1985 housing needs. Particular attention will be paid to the allocation of households between cities and the unincorporated area of each county, since local policies on growth accommodation in unincorporated areas may have changed. In accepting local revisions, the Executive Board will also consider the effect of its decisions to accept revisions on the wastewater treatment needs list (based on Projections 79) included in the approved Environmental Management Plan, and will change the list accordingly after review with the appropriate wastewater agencies.

3. ABAG has estimated replacement needs in 1985 for each jurisdiction based on the limited information available, using assumptions explicitly stated. These are presented in Appendix III.

After consultation with local governments, ABAG's Executive Board will accept revised replacement estimates provided by local governments if such estimates are accompanied by adequate documentation based on available data.

4. The housing needs for unincorporated areas in each county is not distributed in this report. ABAG is only required to determine housing need by jurisdiction, not location within a jurisdiction such as particular parts of the unincorporated area of a county. ABAG will rely on each county to decide how such housing needs are to be addressed in the unincorporated areas.

After consultation with local governments, ABAG's Executive Board will accept revisions to the housing needs determined for unincorporated areas based on more current and reliable data about the timing, magnitude and distribution of growth in unincorporated areas. As in the case of Criteria 2, in accepting these revisions, the Executive Board will use the information in updating the regional projections, will consider the effect of these decisions on the wastewater treatment needs list, and will alter the list accordingly after consultation with the affected agencies.

5. In determining the housing needs of farmworker households, ABAG has estimated the need based on several factors. ABAG staff members have consulted with experts in this field to review the estimates. The estimates are in keeping with the state of the art in dealing with this problem. Because of the assumptions inherent in these estimates, ABAG did not disaggregate the farmworker

households below the county level. It is important that cities and counties work together with ABAG to determine the distribution of farmworker housing need within each county.

After consultation with local governments, ABAG's Executive Board will accept disaggregations and revisions to the farmworker housing need based on current and reliable information that may be available locally.

Local Government Action

Model resolutions are included in the report for local government action on shares of the region's housing needs. In order to make the local revisions process work easily, local governments are requested to adopt any revisions to their shares of the regional housing need effective on March 31, 1982--the last date for such actions. In this way, local governments will have maximum review time and the ABAG Executive Board will have two meetings to consider all local government revisions.

Local governments, if they accept the ABAG-determined share of the regional housing need, should adopt Model Resolution 1 (or similar resolution).

If a local government wishes to revise the ABAG-determined share of the regional housing need, should adopt Model Resolution 2 (or similar resolution) and accompany it with a report indicating the sources of data used in the revision and methodology, where applicable.

If no resolution is adopted, ABAG will presume that the applicable share of the region's housing needs is acceptable to a city or county, and that these shares of the regional housing need will be addressed in the applicable housing elements of local general plans, as required by AB 2853 and other similar laws.

ABAG staff will be available, of course, to meet with staff of local governments prior to any local revision, or prior to ABAG Executive Board action on each such revision. ABAG staff will prepare a brief report to the Executive Board on each revision, with a recommendation for acceptance or reasons why such revision could be found inconsistent with the regional housing need, as required by AB 2853.

MODEL RESOLUTION 1
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCEPTANCE OF HOUSING NEEDS DETERMINATIONS

WHEREAS, the Association of Bay Area Governments is the council of governments (hereinafter "ABAG") under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act for the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, each council of governments is required by Section 65584 of the Government Code, as added by Chapter 1143, Statutes of 1980 (hereinafter "Section 65584"), to determine the existing and projected housing needs for its region; and

WHEREAS, each council of governments is further required to determine each city's and county's share of the regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, ABAG's staff has prepared and circulated, for public review and comment, a draft Housing Needs Report meeting the requirements of Section 65584; and

WHEREAS, after a duly noticed public hearing held on December 17, 1981, the ABAG Executive Board considered the proposed Housing Needs Report and comments thereon; and

WHEREAS, the ABAG Executive Board found such report includes consideration of all factors listed in Section 65584 in making the initial determination of regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Needs Report was approved by the ABAG Executive Board for the purpose of beginning the official review and revision of the determinations contained therein; and

WHEREAS, ABAG's staff have worked with the staff of the (name of jurisdiction) to ensure that the most complete and reliable information has been used in the determination of housing needs for this jurisdiction;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, that, pursuant to Section 65584, the (name of jurisdiction) accepts the determination of its share of the regional housing need, as contained in the December 1981 Housing Needs Report published by ABAG until such number is revised by ABAG as required by law for local housing element revisions due July 1, 1984; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Executive Director of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

MODEL RESOLUTION 2
LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVISION OF HOUSING NEEDS DETERMINATIONS

WHEREAS, the Association of Bay Area Governments is the council of governments (hereinafter "ABAG") under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act for the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, each council of governments is required by Section 65584 of the Government Code, as added by Chapter 1143, Statutes of 1980 (hereinafter "Section 65584"), to determine the existing and projected housing needs for its region; and

WHEREAS, each council of governments is further required to determine each city's and county's share of the regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, ABAG's staff has prepared and circulated, for public review and comment, a draft Housing Needs Report meeting the requirements of Section 65584; and

WHEREAS, after a duly noticed public hearing held on December 17, 1981, the ABAG Executive Board considered the proposed Housing Needs Report and comments thereon; and

WHEREAS, the ABAG Executive Board found such report includes consideration of all factors listed in Section 65584 in proposing the initial determination of regional housing needs; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Needs Report was approved by the ABAG Executive Board for the purpose of beginning the official review and revision of the determinations contained therein; and

WHEREAS, ABAG's staff have worked with the staff of the (name of jurisdiction) to ensure that the most complete and reliable information has been used in the determination of housing needs for this jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the (name of jurisdiction) desires to revise its share of the regional housing need based on

available data and accepted planning methodology in accordance with the requirements of Section 65584;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, that, pursuant to Section 65584, the (name of jurisdiction) revises its share of the regional housing need, as contained in the December 1981 Housing Needs Report published by ABAG; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this revision is made effective March 31, 1982; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the revision, and the data and methodology used to support such revision, is described in the attached report; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ABAG Executive Board is requested to act on such revision in accordance with the requirements of Section 65584; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution and the attached report be transmitted to the Executive Director of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

4. LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS DETERMINATIONS

This chapter contains the determinations required of ABAG by provisions of AB 2853. As noted previously, ABAG is required to determine the existing and projected regional housing need and each city and county share of such need. The tables in this section contain such determinations, along with tables relating to the factors required to be considered in making such determinations. Section 3 describes the local review process. The introductory paragraphs preceding the tables indicate how such numerical information should be interpreted by local governments during the review process.

The data and methods used in producing the estimates in the tables in this section are described in Appendix III.

Existing Housing Need

For purposes of this report, "existing housing need" is defined as the housing need for the Bay Area and its cities and counties in 1980. The estimates produced in Tables B-1 through B-2 serve basically as an "audit" of where the Bay Area was as of April 1, 1980 with respect to housing.

The numbers shown in the tables show that the region had an overall vacancy rate of 3.4% in 1980, compared to a vacancy rate of 4.7% in 1975--the base period for the calculations (see Appendix III for description of the methods and data used).

Readers of the report should be careful to avoid concluding that the estimates of existing need occurred for any particular reason. In many cases, local communities may have issued building permits for construction of residential units that are still outstanding. Generally the lack of available financing for the construction of permitted units has prevented them from being completed. While ABAG recognizes that this has occurred in many parts of the Bay Area, financing for housing construction is not a factor to be considered in determining existing housing need.

Existing need numbers as shown in the tables are not to be added to the numbers shown in the Tables C-1 through C-10. The existing need for additional housing was built into the calculations that produced the projected housing need, as described in Appendix III.

TABLE B-1
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
COUNTIES AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

County	Total Housing Stock 1980	Units Available 1980	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Stock Available
Alameda	444,607	442,293	4,124	0.93%
Contra Costa	252,226	250,460	1,783	0.71
Marin	92,903	90,712	1,378	1.52
Napa	40,052	38,770	240	0.62
San Francisco	316,609	312,809	5,428	1.74
San Mateo	233,494	231,978	1,592	0.69
Santa Clara	473,817	471,265	3,919	0.83
Solano	84,270	83,020	818	0.99
Sonoma	124,233	117,838	726	0.62
Region	2,062,211	2,039,145	20,008	0.98

TABLE B-2
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Alameda	211	0.76%
Albany	31	0.44
Berkeley	1,358	2.96
Emeryville	1	0.00
Fremont	406	0.89
Hayward	388	1.08
Livermore	165	1.00
Newark	49	0.52
Oakland	771	0.51
Piedmont	33	0.86
Pleasanton	64	0.55
San Leandro	197	0.70
Union City	30	0.24
Unincorporated	420	0.88
Total	4,124	0.93

TABLE B-3
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Antioch	29	0.18%
Brentwood	12	0.77
Clayton	5	0.36
Concord	178	0.45
El Cerrito	126	1.28
Hercules	0	0.00
Lafayette	31	0.38
Martinez	33	0.38
Moraga	38	0.76
Pinole	70	1.38
Pittsburg	0	0.00
Pleasant Hill	33	0.33
Richmond	406	1.40
San Pablo	54	0.65
Walnut Creek	54	0.22
Unincorporated	714	1.01
Total	1,783	0.71

TABLE B-4
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
MARIN COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Belvedere	86	9.04
Corte Madera	92	2.81
Fairfax	29	0.86
Larkspur	75	1.35
Mill Valley	116	2.08
Novato	125	0.79
Ross	47	5.32
San Anselmo	50	0.96
San Rafael	198	1.04
Sausalito	19	0.46
Tiburon	75	2.80
Unincorporated	466	1.94
Total	1,378	1.52

TABLE B-5
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
NAPA COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Calistoga	4	0.21
Napa	207	1.03
St. Helena	23	1.07
Yountville	6	0.77
Unincorporated	0	0.00
Total	240	0.62

TABLE B-6
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
San Francisco	5,428	1.74%

TABLE B-7
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Atherton	24	0.97%
Belmont	78	0.79
Brisbane	21	1.52
Burlingame	71	0.56
Colma	0	0.00
Daly City	181	0.65
Foster City	71	0.78
Half Moon Bay	8	0.30
Hillsborough	8	0.23
Menlo Park	97	0.88
Millbrae	51	0.66
Pacifica	82	0.63
Portola Valley	3	0.24
Redwood City	179	0.77
San Bruno	43	0.29
San Carlos	77	0.75
San Mateo	136	0.40
South San Francisco	164	0.91
Woodside	32	1.71
Unincorporated	266	0.99
Total	1,592	0.69

TABLE B-8
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Campbell	97	0.81%
Cupertino	48	0.37
Gilroy	13	0.18
Los Altos	206	2.22
Los Altos Hills	9	0.37
Los Gatos	59	0.55
Milpitas	96	0.82
Monte Sereno	2	0.17
Morgan Hill	18	0.33
Mountain View	177	0.62
Palo Alto	285	1.21
San Jose	1,411	0.66
Santa Clara	331	0.95
Saratoga	74	0.78
Sunnyvale	539	1.23
Unincorporated	554	1.29
Total	3,919	0.83

TABLE B-9
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
SOLANO COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Benicia	130	2.25%
Dixon	0	0.00
Fairfield	234	1.24
Rio Vista	35	2.68
Suisun City	7	0.19
Vacaville	56	0.37
Vallejo	197	0.66
Unincorporated	159	2.65
Total	818	0.99

TABLE B-10
EXISTING HOUSING NEED, 1980
SONOMA COUNTY

City	1980 Existing Housing Need	Need as % of 1980 Housing Stock Available
Cloverdale	7	0.43%
Cotati	1	0.07
Healdsburg	30	1.03
Petaluma	32	0.26
Rohnert Park	0	0.00
Santa Rosa	60	0.17
Sebastopol	15	0.62
Sonoma	7	0.25
Unincorporated	574	1.13
Total	726	0.62

Projected Housing Need

Table C-1 summarizes the 1985 regional housing need by county. Tables C-2 through C-10 present county and city figures. As required by law, the numbers represent the projected shares of the region's housing need. **As previously stated, these numbers already incorporate the existing need. They do not include estimates of replacement for any units that may be lost from the 1980 housing stock.**

In terms of the requirements of law, local government attention during the required local review process should be directed particularly to these estimates. The estimates closely parallel the estimated growth in households incorporated in ABAG's Projections 79, adopted by the General Assembly after a lengthy public review process. ABAG recognizes, however, that circumstances may have changed in local communities since the adoption of the projections, and this would alter the projected housing need.

ABAG's Executive Board intends that this be a principal focus of the 90-day local government review process, and urges city and county staff to work closely with ABAG staff so that local government revisions to the shares of projected housing need can be accepted (in accordance with the requirements of AB 2853) but can also be used as local policy information to be used as part of the regional projections update process.

TABLE C-1
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
COUNTIES AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

County	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Alameda	461,689	481,505	39,212
Contra Costa	281,617	293,216	42,756
Marin	95,272	98,228	7,516
Napa	41,093	43,457	4,687
San Francisco	306,264	324,851	12,042
San Mateo	237,550	245,120	13,142
Santa Clara	512,839	529,813	58,548
Solano	98,927	103,400	20,380
Sonoma	131,856	136,438	18,600
Region	2,167,107	2,257,183	216,883

TABLE C-2
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Alameda	30,016	31,314	3,724
Albany	7,688	7,834	848
Berkeley	45,100	47,588	1,639
Emeryville	2,149	2,421	21
Fremont	52,235	53,961	8,565
Hayward	39,478	41,064	5,287
Livermore	18,586	19,073	2,525
Newark	10,953	11,264	1,804
Oakland	145,160	154,966	3,984
Piedmont	3,812	3,884	62
Pleasanton	14,105	14,426	2,871
San Leandro	27,997	28,865	863
Union City	13,911	14,299	2,028
Uninc.	50,499	52,174	4,991
Total	461,689	481,505	39,212

TABLE C-3
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Antioch	19,839	20,702	4,829
Brentwood	2,565	2,624	1,073
Clayton	2,231	2,310	940
Concord	41,227	42,619	3,281
El Cerrito	9,856	10,121	295
Hercules	3,902	4,112	2,269
Lafayette	8,033	8,291	230
Martinez	10,458	10,887	2,123
Moraga	6,064	6,234	1,255
Pinole	5,171	5,397	340
Pittsburg	13,499	14,319	2,499
Pleasant Hill	10,869	11,274	1,154
Richmond	30,313	31,545	2,616
San Pablo	9,332	9,811	1,489
Walnut Creek	25,611	26,578	2,331
Uninc.	82,647	86,392	16,032
Total	281,617	293,216	42,756

TABLE C-4
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
MARIN COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Belvedere	950	1,039	88
Corte Madera	3,506	3,643	374
Fairfax	3,357	3,473	106
Larkspur	5,637	5,851	281
Mill Valley	5,595	5,766	199
Novato	17,616	18,141	2,248
Ross	890	939	55
San Anselmo	5,279	5,439	253
San Rafael	19,489	19,997	876
Sausalito	4,332	4,480	329
Tiburon	2,999	3,135	453
Uninc.	25,622	26,325	2,254
Total	95,272	98,228	7,516

TABLE C-5
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
NAPA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Calistoga	2,048	2,194	274
Napa	21,224	21,726	1,669
St. Helena	2,593	2,622	469
Yountville	914	929	149
Uninc.	14,314	15,986	2,126
Total	41,093	43,457	4,687

TABLE C-6
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
San Francisco	306,264	324,851	12,042

TABLE C-7
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Atherton	2,481	2,557	73
Belmont	9,980	10,224	310
Brisbane	1,375	1,412	27
Burlingame	12,546	12,816	214
Colma	190	194	29
Daly City	28,344	29,122	1,384
Foster City	10,518	10,902	1,761
Half Moon Bay	3,388	3,475	801
Hillsborough	3,712	3,865	329
Menlo Park	11,028	11,304	264
Millbrae	7,814	8,012	255
Pacifica	13,320	13,752	637
Portola Valley	1,326	1,361	88
Redwood City	24,278	24,873	1,478
San Bruno	13,844	14,682	74
San Carlos	10,688	10,943	616
San Mateo	34,160	35,526	1,371
South San Francisco	18,744	19,295	1,327
Woodside	2,029	2,075	205
Uninc.	27,780	28,730	1,899
Total	237,550	245,120	13,142

TABLE C-8
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Campbell	12,274	12,745	806
Cupertino	14,068	14,446	1,381
Gilroy	8,528	8,953	1,771
Los Altos	9,486	9,841	555
Los Altos Hills	2,872	2,927	517
Los Gatos	11,351	11,745	969
Milpitas	13,848	14,298	2,651
Monte Sereno	1,208	1,247	104
Morgan Hill	6,278	6,528	1,090
Mountain View	28,789	29,919	1,457
Palo Alto	23,652	24,424	832
San Jose	243,329	251,067	35,776
Santa Clara	35,022	35,991	1,203
Saratoga	9,718	9,964	469
Sunnyvale	46,790	48,244	4,345
Uninc.	45,626	47,484	4,622
Total	512,839	529,813	58,548

TABLE C-9
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
SOLANO COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Benicia	6,695	6,897	1,122
Dixon	3,421	3,629	1,053
Fairfield	24,983	25,876	7,077
Rio Vista	1,302	1,367	59
Suisun City	4,973	5,258	1,643
Vacaville	16,408	17,266	2,046
Vallejo	32,695	34,134	4,129
Uninc.	8,450	9,262	3,251
Total	98,927	103,400	20,380

TABLE C-10
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED, 1985
SONOMA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Households	Total Available Housing Needed in 1985	1980-85 Projected Increase in Housing Needed
Cloverdale	1,708	1,762	126
Cotati	1,731	1,794	374
Healdsburg	3,484	3,548	639
Petaluma	14,498	14,926	2,486
Rohnert Park	11,388	11,923	3,232
Santa Rosa	37,819	39,025	4,237
Sebastopol	2,732	2,799	395
Sonoma	3,176	3,231	441
Uninc.	55,320	57,430	6,670
Total	131,856	136,438	18,600

Consideration of Tenure of Housing

ABAG, in making its determinations of regional housing need, is required to consider type and tenure (i.e., owner and renter) of housing. As noted in Appendix III, ABAG staff considered type and tenure of housing separately; while type of housing is examined for 1980, no projections of type of housing are included in these determinations.

Tenure of housing is shown in Tables D-1 through D-10. These figures show how the projected housing need would be distributed by owner and renter category to maintain in the accommodation of projected housing need the same fractions of owner and renter housing estimated to exist in the 1980 housing stock.

The presentation of these figures does not mean that ABAG expects each jurisdiction to construct the derived amounts of rental housing. They mean only that the owner-renter splits shown would be necessary to have the increase in housing stock distributed according to the existing (1980) tenure distribution.

TABLE D-1
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
COUNTIES AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

County	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Alameda	59.0%	41.0%	39,212	16,077
Contra Costa	71.0	29.0	42,756	12,399
Marin	66.0	34.0	7,516	2,555
Napa	65.0	35.0	4,687	1,640
San Francisco	44.0	56.0	12,042	6,744
San Mateo	64.0	36.0	13,142	4,731
Santa Clara	63.0	37.0	58,548	21,662
Solano	69.0	31.0	20,380	6,318
Sonoma	64.0	36.0	18,600	6,696
Region	64.0	36.0	216,883	78,822

TABLE D-2
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Alameda	46.0	54.0	3,724	2,011
Albany	57.0	43.0	848	365
Berkeley	46.0	54.0	1,639	885
Emeryville	23.0	77.0	21	16
Fremont	70.0	30.0	8,565	2,570
Hayward	62.0	38.0	5,287	2,009
Livermore	77.0	23.0	2,525	581
Newark	82.0	18.0	1,804	325
Oakland	50.0	50.0	3,984	1,992
Piedmont	88.0	12.0	62	7
Pleasanton	78.0	22.0	2,871	632
San Leandro	67.0	33.0	863	285
Union City	76.0	24.0	2,028	487
Unincorporated	72.0	28.0	4,991	3,912
Total	59.0	41.0	39,212	16,077

TABLE D-3
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Antioch	71.0	29.0	4,829	1,400
Brentwood	73.0	27.0	1,073	290
Clayton	85.0	15.0	940	141
Concord	64.0	36.0	3,281	1,181
El Cerrito	72.0	28.0	295	83
Hercules	89.0	11.0	2,269	250
Lafayette	72.0	28.0	230	64
Martinez	72.0	28.0	2,123	594
Moraga	67.0	33.0	1,255	414
Pinole	76.0	24.0	340	82
Pittsburg	76.0	24.0	2,499	600
Pleasant Hill	67.0	33.0	1,154	381
Richmond	65.0	35.0	2,616	916
San Pablo	61.0	39.0	1,489	581
Walnut Creek	63.0	37.0	2,331	862
Unincorporated	80.0	20.0	16,032	4,560
Total	71.0	29.0	42,756	12,399

TABLE D-4
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
MARIN COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Belvedere	79.0	21.0	88	18
Corte Madera	68.0	32.0	374	120
Fairfax	72.0	28.0	106	30
Larkspur	45.0	55.0	281	155
Mill Valley	70.0	30.0	199	60
Novato	70.0	30.0	2,248	674
Ross	87.0	13.0	55	7
San Anselmo	73.0	27.0	253	68
San Rafael	56.0	44.0	876	385
Sausalito	51.0	49.0	329	161
Tiburon	60.0	40.0	453	181
Unincorporated	74.0	26.0	2,254	696
Total	66.0	34.0	7,516	2,555

TABLE D-5
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
NAPA COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Calistoga	66.0	34.0	274	93
Napa	60.0	40.0	1,669	668
St. Helena	64.0	36.0	469	169
Yountville	73.0	27.0	149	40
Unincorporated	71.0	29.0	2,126	670
Total	65.0	35.0	4,687	1,640

TABLE D-6
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
San Francisco	44.0	56.0	12,042	6,744

TABLE D-7
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Atherton	89.0	11.0	73	8
Belmont	57.0	43.0	310	133
Brisbane	69.0	31.0	27	8
Burlingame	50.0	50.0	214	107
Colma	82.0	18.0	29	5
Daly City	65.0	35.0	1,384	484
Foster City	57.0	43.0	1,761	757
Half Moon Bay	82.0	18.0	801	144
Hillsborough	91.0	9.0	329	30
Menlo Park	59.0	41.0	264	108
Millbrae	68.0	32.0	255	82
Pacifica	74.0	26.0	637	166
Portola Valley	90.0	10.0	88	9
Redwood City	57.0	43.0	1,478	636
San Bruno	61.0	39.0	74	29
San Carlos	70.0	30.0	616	185
San Mateo	53.0	47.0	1,371	644
South San Francisco	66.0	34.0	1,327	451
Woodside	89.0	11.0	205	23
Unincorporated	74.0	26.0	1,899	722
Total	64.0	36.0	13,142	4,731

TABLE D-8
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Campbell	55.0	45.0	806	363
Cupertino	67.0	33.0	1,381	456
Gilroy	65.0	35.0	1,771	620
Los Altos	80.0	20.0	555	111
Los Altos Hills	86.0	14.0	517	72
Los Gatos	67.0	33.0	969	320
Milpitas	75.0	25.0	2,651	663
Monte Sereno	88.0	12.0	104	12
Morgan Hill	77.0	23.0	1,090	251
Mountain View	37.0	63.0	1,457	918
Palo Alto	59.0	41.0	832	341
San Jose	66.0	34.0	35,776	12,164
Santa Clara	51.0	49.0	1,203	589
Saratoga	85.0	15.0	469	70
Sunnyvale	50.0	50.0	4,345	2,173
Unincorporated	76.0	24.0	4,622	2,539
Total	63.0	37.0	58,548	21,662

TABLE D-9
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
SOLANO COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Benicia	68.0	32.0	1,122	359
Dixon	76.0	24.0	1,053	253
Fairfield	65.0	35.0	7,077	2,477
Rio Vista	74.0	26.0	59	15
Suisun City	71.0	29.0	1,643	476
Vacaville	72.0	28.0	2,046	573
Vallejo	67.0	33.0	4,129	1,363
Unincorporated	83.0	17.0	3,251	802
Total	69.0	31.0	20,380	6,318

TABLE D-10
NEEDED RENTAL STOCK INCREASE IN 1985
TO MAINTAIN ESTIMATED 1980 RENTAL PERCENTAGE
SONOMA COUNTY

City	1980 Percentage Owner	1980 Percentage Renter	Needed Increase in Available Stock for 1985	Rental Units in Available Stock Increase to Maintain 1980 Rental Percentage
Cloverdale	63.0	37.0	126	47
Cotati	57.0	43.0	374	161
Healdsburg	62.0	38.0	639	243
Petaluma	65.0	35.0	2,486	870
Rohnert Park	57.0	43.0	3,232	1,390
Santa Rosa	57.0	43.0	4,237	1,822
Sebastopol	58.0	42.0	395	166
Sonoma	61.0	39.0	441	172
Unincorporated	70.0	30.0	6,670	1,825
Total	64.0	36.0	18,600	6,696

Consideration of Income Levels

ABAG, in making its determinations of regional housing need, is required to consider the need for housing at all income levels. As noted in Appendix III, ABAG staff estimated an income distribution for each community's projected population in 1985.

Tables D-1 though D-10 show how the increase in available housing in 1985 could be distributed by the estimated income levels. **The figures contained in the tables do not mean that each community must construct units for each of the income categories. They mean, however, that, as the available housing in a community increases, new households at the different income levels will be in need of housing. The figures show the number of units that should be available for occupancy by these new households at the given income levels. As a consequence, these households can be accommodated either by the existing stock or by units built to accommodate the projected need.**

TABLE E-1
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
COUNTIES AND SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

County	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Alameda	39,212	23,920	7,450	3,921	3,921
Contra Costa	42,756	25,225	8,979	4,276	4,276
Marin	7,516	4,509	1,353	827	827
Napa	4,687	3,046	750	422	469
San Francisco	12,042	7,225	2,047	1,325	1,445
San Mateo	13,142	6,176	3,549	1,840	1,577
Santa Clara	58,548	31,295	13,460	7,075	6,718
Solano	20,380	12,631	3,467	2,039	2,243
Sonoma	18,600	9,475	4,097	2,421	2,607
Region	216,883	123,502	45,152	24,146	24,083

TABLE E-2
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Alameda	3,724	2,421	633	335	335
Albany	848	560	136	76	76
Berkeley	1,639	1,048	279	148	164
Emeryville	21	13	4	2	2
Fremont	8,565	5,224	1,542	942	857
Hayward	5,287	2,909	1,110	634	634
Livermore	2,525	1,489	480	278	278
Newark	1,804	920	433	235	216
Oakland	3,984	2,271	797	478	438
Piedmont	62	55	3	1	3
Pleasanton	2,871	1,867	488	258	258
San Leandro	863	595	121	69	78
Union City	2,028	973	507	284	264
Uninc.	4,991	3,575	917	181	318
Total	39,212	23,920	7,450	3,921	3,921

TABLE E-3
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Antioch	4,829	2,222	1,304	724	579
Brentwood	1,073	418	333	172	150
Clayton	940	611	160	94	75
Concord	3,281	1,706	787	427	361
El Cerrito	295	203	44	24	24
Hercules	2,269	1,453	408	204	204
Lafayette	230	181	23	14	12
Martinez	2,123	1,168	488	255	212
Moraga	1,255	941	151	88	75
Pinole	340	184	78	41	37
Pittsburg	2,499	774	800	500	425
Pleasant Hill	1,154	682	242	115	115
Richmond	2,616	942	837	445	392
San Pablo	1,489	581	462	238	208
Walnut Creek	2,331	1,725	280	163	163
Uninc.	16,032	11,434	2,582	772	1,244
Total	42,756	25,225	8,979	4,276	4,276

TABLE E-4
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
MARIN COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Belvedere	88	75	5	4	4
Corte Madera	374	217	75	41	41
Fairfax	106	52	24	15	15
Larkspur	281	198	39	22	22
Mill Valley	199	137	28	16	18
Novato	2,248	944	607	337	360
Ross	55	39	6	7	3
San Anselmo	253	134	56	30	33
San Rafael	876	534	158	88	96
Sausalito	329	259	30	20	20
Tiburon	453	353	41	27	32
Uninc.	2,254	1,567	284	220	183
Total	7,516	4,509	1,353	827	827

TABLE E-5
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
NAPA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Calistoga	274	134	63	36	41
Napa	1,669	1,135	234	150	150
St. Helena	469	305	75	42	47
Yountville	149	19	36	46	48
Uninc.	2,126	1,453	342	148	183
Total	4,687	3,046	750	422	469

TABLE E-6
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
San Francisco	12,042	7,225	2,047	1,325	1,445

TABLE E-7
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
SAN MATEO

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Atherton	73	59	7	4	3
Belmont	310	174	68	37	31
Brisbane	27	10	8	5	4
Burlingame	214	124	45	24	21
Colma	29	7	9	7	6
Daly City	1,384	402	429	304	249
Foster City	1,761	1,021	370	194	176
Half Moon Bay	801	257	256	152	136
Hillsborough	329	283	20	13	13
Menlo Park	264	159	53	26	26
Millbrae	255	139	59	31	26
Pacifica	637	198	197	134	108
Portola Valley	88	67	11	5	5
Redwood City	1,478	606	429	236	207
San Bruno	74	27	23	13	11
San Carlos	616	357	129	68	62
San Mateo	1,371	685	343	192	151
South San Francisco	1,327	398	411	279	239
Woodside	205	181	10	6	8
Uninc.	1,899	1,022	672	110	95
Total	13,142	6,176	3,549	1,840	1,577

TABLE E-8
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Campbell	806	411	193	105	97
Cupertino	1,381	912	221	124	124
Gilroy	1,771	673	531	301	266
Los Altos	555	444	50	33	28
Los Altos Hills	517	450	31	15	21
Los Gatos	969	677	136	78	78
Milpitas	2,651	1,114	742	424	371
Monte Sereno	104	83	10	5	6
Morgan Hill	1,090	533	273	142	142
Mountain View	1,457	976	219	131	131
Palo Alto	832	624	92	58	58
San Jose	35,776	17,888	8,944	4,651	4,293
Santa Clara	1,203	674	265	132	132
Saratoga	469	371	47	23	28
Sunnyvale	4,345	2,737	782	391	435
Uninc.	4,622	2,728	924	462	508
Total	58,548	31,295	13,460	7,075	6,718

TABLE E-9
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
SOLANO COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Benicia	1,122	785	146	90	101
Dixon	1,053	669	170	107	107
Fairfield	7,077	4,105	1,274	849	849
Rio Vista	59	41	8	5	5
Suisun City	1,643	296	542	394	411
Vacaville	2,046	1,248	348	225	225
Vallejo	4,129	2,642	661	372	454
Uninc.	3,251	2,842	318	0	91
Total	20,380	12,631	3,467	2,039	2,243

TABLE E-10
PROJECTED NEED, 1985,
BY INCOME CATEGORY
SONOMA COUNTY

City	1985 Projected Housing Need	Above Moderate Income	Moderate Income	Low Income	Very Low Income
Cloverdale	126	56	30	20	20
Cotati	374	149	101	60	64
Healdsburg	639	281	160	96	102
Petaluma	2,486	1,268	547	323	348
Rohnert Park	3,232	1,474	781	456	521
Santa Rosa	4,237	2,585	720	466	466
Sebastapol	395	190	91	55	59
Sonoma	441	243	88	53	57
Uninc.	6,670	3,229	1,579	892	970
Total	18,600	9,475	4,097	2,421	2,607

Farmworker Housing

Table F-1 estimates the projected need for housing for farmworker households. Because of limitations in data, these projected needs are shown only at the county level. In addition, since ABAG staff were unable to accurately determine the number of year-round versus seasonal and migrant workers, the housing needs of farmworkers are only partially included in the projected housing need.

As a consequence, some farmworkers will reside in housing that is available for full-year occupancy, while others will live in housing that is **not** available for year-round occupancy. Housing units that are not available for year-round occupancy, such as in migrant farmworker camps, are not included in the 1985 projected housing need.

TABLE F-1
1985 FARMWORKER HOUSING NEEDS
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, BY COUNTY

County	Farmworkers 1980	Farmworkers 1985	1985 Farmworker Households
Alameda	1,910	1,850	1,057
Contra Costa	740	610	349
Marin	---	---	---
Napa	2,730	3,630	2,074
San Francisco	---	---	---
San Mateo	1,860	1,870	1,069
Santa Clara	4,160	4,000	2,286
Solano	1,820	1,850	1,057
Sonoma	4,040	3,450	1,971
Region	17,260	17,260	9,863

Source: Employment Development Department Annual Survey, 1980, and ABAG estimates.

Replacement of Existing Housing

Projecting the need for housing unit construction to accommodate the growth in households expected is only one factor in determining the projected need for housing. The other major component of housing need is for replacement of units estimated to be lost in the stock for the forecast period (that is, through 1985). Losses in the housing stock occur through planned demolitions, conversions to non-residential uses (e.g., converting an upper-floor unit to commercial office space), and non-planned losses from fires, floods, earthquakes and other natural phenomena.

For purposes of this report, ABAG staff estimates replacement need for 1985 using two assumptions:

- That the rates of loss in the housing stock from 1980 to 1985 will be one-half the rates of loss as calculated by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. These results are shown in the second column of Tables G-1 through G-9.

- That as housing value increases between 1980 and 1985, rehabilitation of existing substandard units will become more feasible economically, and these units will not be lost from the stock during the 1980-1985 period. These results are shown in the third column of Tables G-1 through G-9.

The estimates are not calculated in the increase in available housing in Tables C-1 through C-10 because it cannot be assumed that these units will, in fact, be lost from the housing stock between 1980 and 1985. In terms of interpretation, if the units estimated as replacement need are not lost from the stock, they would not be subtracted from estimates of housing stock available in 1985. If local agencies actually expect such losses to occur, production goals should include replacing them.

TABLE G-1
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Alameda	818	411	234
Albany	207	104	59
Berkeley	1,362	685	390
Emeryville	71	36	21
Fremont	1,346	677	386
Hayward	1,061	533	304
Livermore	491	247	141
Newark	280	141	80
Oakland	4,475	2,251	1,282
Piedmont	113	57	32
Pleasanton	343	172	98
San Leandro	830	418	238
Union City	363	183	104
Unincorporated	1,350	680	388
Total	13,110	6,595	3,757

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-2
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Antioch	471	237	135
Brentwood	46	23	13
Clayton	41	20	11
Concord	1,166	587	334
El Cerrito	291	147	83
Hercules	55	27	15
Lafayette	239	120	68
Martinez	260	131	75
Moraga	148	74	42
Pinole	149	75	43
Pittsburg	350	176	100
Richmond	858	431	246

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-2 (continued)
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
San Pablo	246	124	71
Walnut Creek	718	362	206
Unincorporated	2,086	1,200	685
Total	7,424	3,734	2,127

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-3
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
MARIN COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Belvedere	24	12	7
Corte Madera	81	41	23
Fairfax	83	42	24
Larkspur	138	69	39
Mill Valley	138	69	39
Novato	393	198	113
Ross	22	11	6
San Anselmo	128	65	37
San Rafael	473	238	136
Sausalito	103	51	29
Tiburon	66	33	19
Unincorporated	596	299	171
Total	2,245	1,128	643

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.5% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.5% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-4
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
NAPA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Calistoga	38	19	11
Napa	398	200	114
St. Helena	43	21	12
Yountville	15	8	5
Unincorporated	275	138	77
Total	769	386	219

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-5
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
San Francisco	10,851	5,463	3,112

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.7% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.7% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-6
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Atherton	74	37	21
Belmont	294	148	84
Brisbane	41	21	12
Burlingame	374	188	107
Colma	5	2	1
Daly City	822	414	236
Foster City	271	136	77
Half Moon Bay	79	40	23
Hillsborough	105	53	30
Menlo Park	327	165	94
Millbrae	230	116	66
Pacifica	389	196	112
Portola Valley	38	19	11

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-6 (continued)
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Redwood City	693	349	199
San Bruno	433	218	124
San Carlos	306	154	88
San Mateo	1,012	509	290
South San Francisco	533	268	153
Woodside	55	28	16
Unincorporated	795	398	227
Total	6,876	3,459	1,971

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.6% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-7
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Campbell	237	119	68
Cupertino	259	130	74
Gilroy	142	72	41
Los Altos	184	92	52
Los Altos Hills	48	24	14
Los Gatos	214	107	61
Milpitas	231	116	66
Monte Sereno	23	11	6
Morgan Hill	108	54	31
Mountain View	565	283	161
Palo Alto	468	235	134
San Jose	4,272	2,144	1,221

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-7 (continued)
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Santa Clara	690	346	197
Saratoga	188	95	54
Sunnyvale	871	437	249
Unincorporated	850	429	245
Total	9,350	4,694	2,674

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.4% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-8
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SOLANO COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Benicia	283	143	81
Dixon	126	64	36
Fairfield	921	465	265
Rio Vista	64	32	18
Suisun City	177	89	51
Vacaville	746	377	215
Vallejo	1,471	743	423
Unincorporated	281	142	82
Total	4,069	2,055	1,171

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 1.0% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 1.0% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

TABLE G-9
REPLACEMENT NEED 1985
SONOMA COUNTY

City	Modified State Method	Reduced Public Removals*	Housing Value Adjusted Replacement Estimate**
Cloverdale	40	20	11
Cotati	35	18	10
Healdsburg	72	36	21
Petaluma	308	155	88
Rohnert Park	215	108	62
Santa Rosa	861	433	247
Sebastopol	60	30	17
Sonoma	69	35	20
Unincorporated	1,257	631	359
Total	2,917	1,466	835

* Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.5% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan.

** Assumes removals will occur at one half the annual rate of 0.5% assumed in the Statewide Housing Plan, adjusted for housing value increases expected between 1980 and 1985.

APPENDIX I. TEXT OF AB 2853 (CHAPTER 1143, STATUTES OF 1980)

Assembly Bill No. 2853

CHAPTER 1143

An act to amend Section 65302 of, and to add Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) to Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code relating to local planning.

[Approved by Governor September 26, 1980. Filed with Secretary of State September 26, 1980.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2853, Roos. Local planning: mobilehome parks and housing elements.

(1) Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a county or city to regulate by zoning ordinance the various uses to which property within the jurisdiction may be put, and requires the legislative body to establish a planning agency to, among other things, develop and maintain a general plan.

This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development, within 30 days after the effective date of this bill, to prepare and send to each county and city a questionnaire requesting prescribed information concerning the zoning regulations applicable to mobilehome parks, and would require the department to evaluate and report to the Legislature on the information received on or before July 1, 1981.

(2) Existing law requires the adoption by every county and city of a local general plan, including a housing element. Under present law, the housing element is required to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Under present law, there are no specific time limitations for periodic revision of the housing element, and the Office of Planning and Research may grant limited time extensions for completion of the element.

This bill would enact substantially more detailed requirements for the housing element and, among other things, would require counties and cities to plan in the housing element for meeting their "appropriate share of the regional demand for housing," as determined pursuant to a specified procedure involving the council of governments for the region, the state's Department of Housing and Community Development, or the department alone in areas not having such a council. The bill would require each county and city to conform its housing element to the bill on or before October 1, 1981. The bill would require every city and county to revise its housing element, as specified at least every 5 years, except that the first revision would be due by July 1, 1984.

(3) Under existing law, Sections 2231 and 2234 of the Revenue and Taxation Code require the state to reimburse local agencies and

school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Other provisions require the Department of Finance to review statutes disclaiming these costs and provide, in certain cases, for making claims to the State Board of Control for reimbursement. The statutory provisions requiring reimbursement will be supplemented by a constitutional requirement of reimbursement effective for statutes enacted on or after July 1, 1980.

This bill provides that no appropriation is made by this act pursuant to the constitutional mandate or Section 2231 or 2234, but recognizes that local agencies and school districts may pursue their other available remedies to seek reimbursement for these costs.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Department of Housing and Community Development shall within 30 days after the effective date of this section prepare and send to each county and city a questionnaire requesting the following information:

(1) The number of mobilehome parks within the jurisdiction, and the authorized number of mobilehome sites in each park.

(2) The number of requests or permit applications for change of use of the mobilehome park.

(3) The number of applications for the establishment of new mobilehome parks.

(4) The disposition of requests or permit applications for change of use of mobilehome parks or applications for the establishment of new mobilehome parks and the reasons for denial of such requests or applications.

(5) The availability of land within the jurisdiction that may be appropriate for establishment of mobilehome parks.

(6) Local established practices, policies, and ordinances concerning change of use of mobilehome parks.

(7) Local efforts and policies for reducing the incidence of change of use of mobilehome parks within the jurisdiction.

The information specified in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, shall cover the period from January 1, 1979, through December 31, 1979. The information specified in paragraphs (5) to (7), inclusive, shall reflect current conditions and circumstances as of the time of the completion of the questionnaire.

The department shall prepare and submit a written report to the Legislature on or before July 1, 1981, containing an evaluation of the information received in response to the questionnaire.

This section shall apply to charter cities and counties as well as general law cities and counties.

SEC. 2. Section 65302 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65302. The general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and

text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals. The plan shall include the following elements:

(a) A land use element which designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, education, public buildings and grounds, solid and liquid waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses of land. The land use element shall include a statement of the standards of population density and building intensity recommended for the various districts and other territory covered by the plan. The land use element shall also identify areas covered by the plan which are subject to flooding and shall be reviewed annually with respect to such areas.

(b) A circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan.

(c) A housing element as provided in Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580).

(d) A conservation element for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources including water and its hydraulic force, forests, soils, rivers and other waters, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources. That portion of the conservation element including waters shall be developed in coordination with any countywide water agency and with all district and city agencies which have developed, served, controlled or conserved water for any purpose for the county or city for which the plan is prepared. The conservation element may also cover:

(1) The reclamation of land and waters.

(2) Flood control.

(3) Prevention and control of the pollution of streams and other waters.

(4) Regulation of the use of land in stream channels and other areas required for the accomplishment of the conservation plan.

(5) Prevention, control, and correction of the erosion of soils, beaches, and shores.

(6) Protection of watersheds.

(7) The location, quantity and quality of the rock, sand and gravel resources.

The conservation element shall be prepared and adopted no later than December 31, 1973.

(e) An open-space element as provided in Article 10.5 (commencing with Section 65560) of this chapter.

(f) A seismic safety element consisting of an identification and appraisal of seismic hazards such as susceptibility to surface ruptures from faulting, to ground shaking, to ground failures, or to effects of seismically induced waves such as tsunamis and seiches.

The seismic safety element shall also include an appraisal of mudslides, landslides, and slope stability as necessary geologic hazards that must be considered simultaneously with other hazards such as possible surface ruptures from faulting, ground shaking, ground failure and seismically induced waves.

To the extent that a county's seismic safety element is sufficiently detailed containing appropriate policies and programs for adoption by a city, a city may adopt that portion of the county's seismic safety element that pertains to the city planning area within the county's jurisdiction, in satisfaction of this subdivision.

In adopting a county seismic safety element, a city shall follow all requirements regarding the content and adoption of general plan elements as set forth in this article and Article 6 (commencing with Section 65350) of this chapter.

Each county and city shall submit to the Division of Mines and Geology of the Department of Conservation one copy of the seismic safety element and any technical studies used for developing the seismic safety element.

(g) A noise element, which shall recognize guidelines adopted by the Office of Noise Control pursuant to Section 46050.1 of the Health and Safety Code, and which quantifies the community noise environment in terms of noise exposure contours for both near- and long-term levels of growth and traffic activity. Such noise exposure information shall become a guideline for use in development of the land use element to achieve noise compatible land use and also to provide baseline levels and noise source identification for local noise ordinance enforcement.

The sources of environmental noise considered in this analysis shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Highways and freeways.

(2) Primary arterials and major local streets.

(3) Passenger and freight on-line railroad operations and ground rapid transit systems.

(4) Commercial, general aviation, heliport, helistop, and military airport operations, aircraft overflights, jet engine test stands, and all other ground facilities and maintenance functions related to airport operation.

(5) Local industrial plants, including, but not limited to, railroad classification yards.

(6) Other ground stationary noise sources identified by local agencies as contributing to the community noise environment.

The noise exposure information shall be presented in terms of noise contours expressed in community noise equivalent level (CNEL) or day-night average level (L_{dn}). CNEL means the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. and after addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m. L_{dn} means the average

equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m.

The contours shall be shown in minimum increments of 5db and shall continue down to 60db. For areas deemed noise sensitive, including, but not limited to, areas containing schools, hospitals, rest homes, long-term medical or mental care facilities, or any other land-use areas deemed noise sensitive by the local jurisdiction, the noise exposure shall be determined by monitoring.

A part of the noise element shall also include the preparation of a community noise exposure inventory, current and projected, which identifies the number of persons exposed to various levels of noise throughout the community.

The noise element shall also recommend mitigating measures and possible solutions to existing and foreseeable noise problems.

The state, local, or private agency responsible for the construction, maintenance, or operation of those transportation, industrial, or other commercial facilities specified in paragraph 2 of this subdivision shall provide to the local agency producing the general plan, specific data relating to current and projected levels of activity and a detailed methodology for the development of noise contours given this supplied data, or they shall provide noise contours as specified in the foregoing statements.

It shall be the responsibility of the local agency preparing the general plan to specify the manner in which the noise element will be integrated into the city or county's zoning plan and tied to the land use and circulation elements and to the local noise ordinance. The noise element, once adopted, shall also become the guideline for determining compliance with the state's noise insulation standards, as contained in Section 1092 of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code.

(h) A scenic highway element for the development, establishment, and protection of scenic highways pursuant to the provisions of Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 260) of Chapter 2 of Division 1 of the Streets and Highways Code.

(i) A safety element for the protection of the community from fires and geologic hazards including features necessary for such protection as evacuation routes, peak load water supply requirements, minimum road widths, clearances around structures, and geologic hazard mapping in areas of known geologic hazards.

The requirements of this section shall apply to charter cities.

SEC. 3. Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) is added to Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code, to read:

Article 10.6. Housing Elements

65580. The Legislature finds and declares as follows:

(a) The availability of housing is of vital statewide importance,

and the early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family is a priority of the highest order.

(b) The early attainment of this goal requires the cooperative participation of government and the private sector in an effort to expand housing opportunities and accommodate the housing needs of Californians of all economic levels.

(c) The provision of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households requires the cooperation of all levels of government.

(d) Local and state governments have a responsibility to use the powers vested in them to facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

(e) The Legislature recognizes that in carrying out this responsibility, each local government also has the responsibility to consider economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the general plan and to cooperate with other local governments and the state in addressing regional housing needs.

65581. It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this article:

(a) To assure that counties and cities recognize their responsibilities in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal.

(b) To assure that counties and cities will prepare and implement housing elements which, along with federal and state programs, will move toward attainment of the state housing goal.

(c) To recognize that each locality is best capable of determining what efforts are required by it to contribute to the attainment of the state housing goal, provided such a determination is compatible with the state housing goal and regional housing needs.

(d) To ensure that each local government cooperates with other local governments in order to address regional housing needs.

65582. As used in this article:

(a) "Community," "locality," "local government," or "jurisdiction" means a city, city and county, or county.

(b) "Department" means the Department of Housing and Community Development.

(c) "Housing element" or "element" means the housing element of the community's general plan, as required pursuant to this article and subdivision (c) of Section 65302.

65583. The housing element shall consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The housing element shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, and mobilehomes, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The element shall contain all

of the following:

(a) An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs. The assessment and inventory shall include the following:

(1) Analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels. Such existing and projected needs shall include the locality's share of the regional housing need in accordance with Section 65584.

(2) Analysis and documentation of household characteristics, including level of payment compared to ability to pay, housing characteristics, including overcrowding, and housing stock condition.

(3) An inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment, and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites.

(4) Analysis of potential and actual governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees and other exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures.

(5) Analysis of potential and actual nongovernmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction.

(6) Analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the handicapped, elderly, large families, farmworkers, and families with female heads of households.

(7) Analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development.

(b) A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

It is recognized that the total housing needs identified pursuant to subdivision (a) may exceed available resources and the community's ability to satisfy this need within the content of the general plan requirements outlined in Article 5 (commencing with Section 65300). Under these circumstances, the quantified objectives need not be identical to the identified existing housing needs, but should establish the maximum number of housing units that can be constructed, rehabilitated, and conserved over a five-year time frame.

(c) A program which sets forth a five-year schedule of actions the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element through the administration of land use and development controls, provision of regulatory concessions and

incentives, and the utilitzation of appropriate federal and state financing and subsidy programs when available. In order to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, the program shall do all of the following:

(1) Identify adequate sites which will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards and with public services and facilities needed to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of types of housing for all income levels, including rental housing, factory-built housing and mobilehomes, in order to meet the community's housing goals as identified in subdivision (b).

(2) Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income households.

(3) Address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.

(4) Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock.

(5) Promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, or color.

The program shall include an identification of the agencies and officials responsible for the implementation of the various actions and the means by which consistency will be achieved with other general plan elements and community goals. The local government shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort.

65584. (a) For purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, a locality's share of the regional housing needs includes that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by a jurisdiction's general plan. The distribution of regional housing needs shall, based upon available data, take into consideration market demand for housing, employment opportunities, the availability of suitable sites and public facilities, commuting patterns, type and tenure of housing need, and the housing needs of farmworkers. The distribution shall seek to avoid further impaction of localities with relatively high proportions of lower income households. Based upon data provided by the Department of Housing and Community Development relative to the statewide need for housing, each council of governments shall determine the existing and projected housing need for its region. The Department of Housing and Community Development shall ensure that this determination is consistent with the statewide housing need and may revise the determination of the council of governments if necessary to obtain this consistency. Each locality's share shall be determined by the appropriate council of governments consistent with the criteria above with the advice of the department subject to the procedure established pursuant to

subdivision (c).

(b) For areas with no council of governments, the Department of Housing and Community Development shall determine housing market areas and define the regional housing need for localities within these areas. Where the department determines that a local government possesses the capability and resources and has agreed to accept the responsibility, with respect to its jurisdiction, for the identification and determination of housing market areas and regional housing needs, the department shall delegate this responsibility to the local governments within these areas.

(c) Within 90 days following a determination of a council of governments pursuant to subdivision (a), or the department's determination pursuant to subdivision (b), a local government may revise the definition of its share of the regional housing need. The revised share shall be based upon available data and accepted planning methodology, and supported by adequate documentation. Within 60 days of the local government's revision, the council of governments or the department, as the case may be, shall accept the revision or shall indicate, based upon available data and accepted planning methodology, why the revision is inconsistent with the regional housing need. The housing element shall contain an analysis of the factors and circumstances, with all supporting data, justifying the revision. All materials and data used to justify any revision shall be made available upon request by any interested party within 45 days upon payment of reasonable costs of reproduction unless such costs are waived due to economic hardship.

(d) Any authority to review and revise a local government's share of the regional housing need granted under this section shall not constitute authority to revise, approve, or disapprove the manner in which the local government's share of the regional housing need is implemented through its housing program.

65585. (a) Each city, county, and city and county shall consider the guidelines adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Section 50459 of the Health and Safety Code in preparation and amendment of the housing element pursuant to this article. Such guidelines shall be advisory to each local government in order to assist it in the preparation of its housing element.

(b) At least 90 days prior to adoption of the housing element pursuant to this article and Section 65357, or at least 45 days prior to the adoption of an amendment to this element, the planning agency of a city, county, or city and county shall submit a draft of the element or amendment to the Department of Housing and Community Development. The department shall review drafts submitted to it and report its findings to the planning agency within 90 days of receipt of the draft in the case of adoption of the housing element pursuant to this article, or within 45 days of receipt of the draft in the case of an amendment. The legislative body shall consider the

department's findings prior to final adoption of the housing element or amendment.

(c) Each local government shall provide the department with a copy of its adopted housing element or amendments. The department may review adopted housing elements or amendments and report its findings.

(d) Except as provided in Section 65586, any and all findings made by the Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to subdivisions (b) and (c) shall be advisory to the local government.

65586. Local governments shall conform their housing elements to the provisions of this article on or before October 1, 1981. Jurisdictions with housing elements adopted before October 1, 1981, in conformity with the housing element guidelines adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development on December 7, 1977, and located in Subchapter 3 (commencing with Section 6300) of Chapter 6 of Part 1 of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code, shall be deemed in compliance with this article as of its effective date. A locality with a housing element found to be adequate by the department before October 1, 1981, shall be deemed in conformity with these guidelines.

65587. (a) Each city, county, or city and county shall bring its housing element, as required by subdivision (c) of Section 65302, into conformity with the requirements of this article on or before October 1, 1981. No extension of time for such purpose may be granted pursuant to Section 65302.6, notwithstanding its provisions to the contrary.

(b) Any action brought by any interested party to review the conformity with the provisions of this article of any housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto shall be brought pursuant to Section 1085 of the Code of Civil Procedure; the court's review of compliance with the provisions of this article shall extend to whether the housing element or portion thereof or revision thereto reasonably complies with the requirements of this article.

65588. (a) Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate all of the following:

(1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal.

(2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community's housing goals and objectives.

(3) The progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementation of the housing element.

(b) The housing element shall be revised as appropriate, but not less than every five years, to reflect the results of this periodic review, except that the first such revision shall be accomplished by July 1, 1984.

65589. (a) Nothing in this article shall require a city, county, or city and county to do any of the following:

(1) Expend local revenues for the construction of housing, housing subsidies, or land acquisition.

(2) Disapprove any residential development which is consistent with the general plan.

(b) Nothing in this article shall be construed to be a grant of authority or a repeal of any authority which may exist of a local government to impose rent controls or restrictions on the sale of real property.

(c) Nothing in this article shall be construed to be a grant of authority or a repeal of any authority which may exist of a local government with respect to measures that may be undertaken or required by a local government to be undertaken to implement the housing element of the local general plan.

(d) The provisions of this article shall be construed consistent with, and in promotion of, the statewide goal of a sufficient supply of decent housing to meet the needs of all Californians.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding Section 2231 or 2234 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, no appropriation is made by this act pursuant to these sections. It is recognized, however, that a local agency or school district may pursue any remedies to obtain reimbursement available to it under Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 2201) of Part 4 of Division 1 of that code.

SEC. 5. Section 2 of this act shall become operative October 1, 1981.

o

APPENDIX II. BACKGROUND PAPER ON LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF REGIONAL REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS DETERMINATIONS

This appendix describes the requirements imposed by provisions of AB 2853 on councils of governments to determine existing and projected housing needs. It also describes previous and related legal housing element activities.

Statutory Requirements

Although regional housing need is not defined precisely in the statutes, the basic ingredients of the regional housing needs determination process may be inferred from Section 65584 of Article 10.6 of the Government Code:

> ...a locality's share of the regional housing needs includes that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area signficantly affected by the jurisdiction's general plan.

Once ABAG has completed the determination of regional housing needs, the Department of Housing and Community Development may revise this determination to obtain "consistency" with the statewide housing need. ABAG's determination of the existing and projected regional need for housing, and the local shares of such needs, must take into account six factors specified in subsection (a) of Section 65584:

- Market demand for housing
- Employment opportunities
- Availability of suitable sites and public facilities
- Commuting patterns
- Type and tenure of housing
- Housing needs of farmworkers.

The law also requires that the distribution of regional housing needs "seek to avoid further impaction of localities with relatively high proportions of lower income households."

In preparing this report, ABAG staff have used available information from many data sources. Among these is Projections 79, the most current set of ABAG's projections of population, employment and land uses. Where certain aspects of the projections and modeling system have been refined since the adoption of the projections in November 1979 and the publication of the Projections 79 report in January 1980, these have been incorporated in the analysis described in this this report. Chief among these is the revised projections of employment growth in the region (see discussion of employment opportunities below).

Market Demand for Housing

The Bay Area is an attractive place to live and work. Its job growth and population growth in recent years have been substantial. Detailed housing market analysis for a region of nine counties, several major cities and many smaller urban centers, as well as many suburban cities and rural areas, has not generally been conducted as part of ABAG's regional planning programs.

There is, however, extensive information available that may be used to ascertain the demand for housing--as reflected by the growth in households assumed for the Bay Area in ABAG's projections, housing value trends, market transactions and income/affordability analysis. All influence the estimates of housing supply needed, as well as the potential to realize the housing demand--in the form of incomes sufficient to cover the costs of shelter.

For purposes of this report, **market demand is explicitly considered in producing the estimates of vacancy needed to accommodate the present and forecast population levels (see Appendix III) and in estimating the distribution of 1985 housing needs by income level and type and tenure (see discussion on type and tenure below).**

Employment Opportunities

Job growth and the geographical distribution of employment opportunities (current and future) was considered extensively in the development of ABAG's projections of population, employment and housing (Projections 79). The general conclusions to be drawn from that analysis are summarized in this subsection.

The January 1980 projections report noted expansion of wage and salary employment in the region from 1.9 million to 2.8 million from 1975 to 2000. This was an annual

average growth rate of approximately 1.5%--somewhat lower than the 2% annual growth experienced in the Bay Area from 1960 to 1975. The growth pattern projected was part of an overall national trend showing increasing automation in manufacturing and slowdown in the growth of population and income. The Bay Area, however, was expected in the report to **improve** its relative position in the national economy, with increasing shares of employment in key growth industries--notably the services sector with an annual average growth rate of 2%.

Although the manufacturing sector was projected to grow at a rate 1.2% each year, specific manufacturing industries producing high technology products such as electronic components, computers and scientific instruments were projected to grow at substantially higher rates. Food processing was projected to decline in employment. Finance, insurance, real estate, government, trade and other industries were projected to show moderate rates of growth, close to the overall average.

Twenty major employment centers in 1975 accounted for about 77% of basic employment in the region. These are shown in Table II-1. Basic employment is the portion of total employment that serves markets outside the region; this sector provides the best indicator of long-term economic growth. By its nature, basic employment relies upon unique transportation access, interactions with other industries and proximity to special markets. Hence it tends to be more concentrated than either population or employment primarily serving local markets. Nineteen of the 20 major centers were projected to maintain their importance through the year 2000 (Vallejo drops off, replaced by Santa Rosa).

While San Francisco was projected to maintain its number 1 ranking, there were several changes expected to occur. San Jose's ranking in the year 2000 was expected to be higher, along with several other job centers such as Fremont, Hayward, Santa Rosa and Concord. Several older areas, including Richmond, Alameda and South San Francisco were projected to decline in relative importance.

The most recent estimates of Bay Area employment growth are contained in the working papers on ABAG's revised regional demographic-economic modeling system With respect to employment growth, the preliminary baseline forecast of employment indicates a compound growth rate of 2.0% annually through the year 2000, contrasted with the 1.5% increase associated with Projections 79.

For purposes of the regional housing needs analysis, current employment estimates and employment forecasts

TABLE II-1
TWENTY RANKING EMPLOYMENT CENTERS IN 1975
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Rank	Employment Center	Estimated Basic Employment	% of Region
1.	San Francisco Area	235,582	25.0%
2.	Oakland Area	82,353	8.7
3.	San Jose Area	73,890	7.8
4.	Sunnyvale Area	48,534	5.2
5.	Palo Alto Area	39,721	4.2
6.	Berkeley Area	30,845	3.3
7.	Santa Clara Area	28,433	3.0
8.	San Leandro Area	21,517	2.3
9.	Mountain View	21,034	2.2
10.	S.F. Int. Airport Area	17,486	1.9
11.	Richmond Area	14,709	1.6
12.	Alameda Area	14,595	1.5
13.	South S. F. Area	13,949	1.5
14.	Fremont Area	13,662	1.4
15.	Menlo Park Area	13,026	1.4
16.	Vallejo Area	12,870	1.4
17.	Hayward Area	12,390	1.3
18.	Redwood City Area	12,082	1.3
19.	Livermore Area	11,642	1.2
20.	Concord Area	11,195	1.2
Total		729,515	77.4

Source: ABAG, Projections 79

by county are used explicitly as a weighting factor in calculating existing and future housing needs (See Appendix III.

Availability of Suitable Sites and Public Facilities

Among the most critical factors in the accommodating the projected growth in the region's households is the availability of residentially zoned land and the necessary sewers, streets and other public facilities supporting development. This factor is required to be considered in the distribution of the region's housing needs.

Projections 79 was developed using an extensive survey of local development policies affecting the timing, magnitude and location of urban growth. These policies were surveyed through ABAG's Environmental Management Program in 1976. This was the most complete regional survey of local development policies conducted in the Bay Area. While ABAG has reviewed local development policies in certain parts of the region since completion of the local development policy survey, no systematic regional update of this information has occurred. Nevertheless, the local policy survey information incorporated into Projections 79 is the most current way of estimating land availability for the Bay Area.

Land Availability. The 1979 ABAG projections account explicitly for a wide array of local land development policies. These policies define the supply of land assumed developable to accommodate the region's projection of population, housing, commerce and industry. The assumed developable land supply accounts for the policy information on where and when local regulations and service capacities **could accommodate** development and at what density. The projection system then estimates how much of the assumed developable land **would be needed to accommodate** regional growth, and when. The projections should not a be interpreted as a point-by-point reiteration of each jurisdiction's development policy. Rather, they constitute an assessment of the impact of those policies, taken together, on regionwide growth patterns.

In the local policy survey, land available for development was placed into two categories called "policy prime" and "policy secondary." Policy prime included areas of high or medium development potential, where development was already committed by local government action in the form of zoning, subdivisions, and existence or commitment of service capacities for sewers, water and roads. Policy secondary included areas where tentative local commitment

had been made to development in the form of zoning, but which have some constraints on local service capacity or where environmental hazards exist.

In applying regional and local growth trends to this land, assumptions were made about the densities of residential, industrial and commercial development. The density of new development as it affects the distribution of new housing was a key assumption in Projections 79. **The basic assumption was that zoning density in force in 1975, as determined by the local development policy survey, would continue unchanged up to 1985.** At that point, the region's developable land supply--constrained by lack of sewer, water and transportation commitments--is projected to begin running low relative to the Bay Area's total economic and population growth potential.

Land availability information, then, is already incorporated into ABAG's projections data base. **Land availability constraints are used in adjusting the weighting factors in determining the existing housing need (see Appendix III). For the determination of projected regional housing needs and local shares of such need--that is, 1985 housing needs--no additional assumptions have been made regarding land availability.** Further information about the development policy assumptions used in preparing Projections 79 is documented in the projections report.

Transportation Network. The assumptions about regional transportation systems and associated measures of transportation accessibility are key aspects in the distribution of growth in the region's population, households and employment. A single improved and integrated regional transit and highway system was assumed in the Projections 79 report to be operational by 1985. The assumed improvements related to probable additions or changes in the facilities and services that existed in 1975, as represented in the 1975 highway and transit system described by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Although these assumptions are based on MTC's ten-year development plan, they do not include every anticipated local capital improvement (such as safety improvements on minor arterials), nor do they need to for regionwide growth projections. The highway and transit system assumptions were translated to estimates of peak period levels of service by transportation facility type. The level of service estimates were in turn translated into estimates of travel time from location to location. Such measures of accessibility become key assumptions in locating housing vis a vis job locations (see discussion

on commuting patterns below).

The 1985 regional highway system described by MTC for the development of Projections 79 included only planned improvements that would significantly affect representation of the highway system; these changes included the extension or widening of major highways and the construction of major highway interchanges. For local streets and arterials, significant projects funded by Federal Aid Urban (FAU) assistance and therefore assumed in the 1985 highway network include major widening projects, converting from undivided to divided roadway projects, and construction of major streets and interchanges. The nature of **the assumptions for the 1985 highway network can be summarized as a generally small amount of expansion in the freeway system and a considerable amount of FAU projects to improve existing highway facilities.**

For transit, the major assumptions were that service levels will be improved on existing transit and that some new bus lines, particularly feeder and express buses, will be added. **No major capital improvements, such as new BART lines, were assumed.**

In summary, then, the **transportation assumptions from the earlier projections were not changed in the development of the housing needs determinations described in this report.**

Sewage Treatment Capacity. Provision of wastewater treatment is a major factor in determining the capacity of the region to support development. Following passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, the construction of improved sewage treatment facilities stepped up considerably--largely because the Federal government paid 75% of the eligible construction costs.

California puts up 12.5% of the construction costs of sewage treatment facilities under the s. 201 program, and local governments the remaining 12.5% of these capital improvements. The local share of the construction cost together with the cost of operation and maintenance was to be financed, according to Federal law, by user charges (fees charged homeowners and businesses for use of the system).

By 1975 in the Bay Area, the construction of wastewater treatment facilities had required an investment of more than $2 billion (totalled in current dollars). As part of the development of the region's Environmental Management Plan, adopted by ABAG in 1978, it was estimated that an additional $240 million each year would be necessary to

pay for water pollution control facilities. However, the Federal government may not provide financial assistance for such facilities very much longer. Current legislation before Congress would reauthorize the construction grants program, but with reduced funding and redefined eligibility categories.

The Senate version of the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act has the basic Federal share of treatment facility costs declining to 55% from the 75% Federal share now provided. In addition, the Senate version provides for no reserve capacity beyond the 1980 population level except for projects with grants for construction of one or more segments approved prior to October 1, 1983. **Thus new capacity for growth in urban areas may have to be provided entirely by State and local funds.**

Based on the information summarized above, ABAG staff believed it important to consider availability of wastewater treatment capacity as part of the process of determining the region's projected housing needs. ABAG staff examined reports filed with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine the current status of wastewater treatment capacity compared to design capacity.

This examination was first made on the basis of current average dry weather flow in million gallons per day relative to design capacity. This enables a gross approximation of treatment capacity. Based on this review, most wastewater dischargers have sufficient treatment capacity through 1985 to handle the projected increases in population. In some cases where treatment capacity is nearing design limits, plant expansions are being constructed or planned to accommodate growth and capacity is likely to be available by 1985.

In a few cases, gross flow is not a sufficient indicator of available wastewater treatment capacity. In certain cases, the current organic loadings exceed the plant's design loading and this indicates wastewater treatment plants may not have sufficient capacity to accommodate additional growth. However, it may be reasonably assumed that **sufficient wastewater treatment capacity through 1985 is available and that projected household growth can be accommodated in most cases.** The wastewater treatment capacity analysis is documented in a technical memorandum and will be discussed with individual cities and counties during the local review process of the housing needs determinations to ensure that additional consideration is given to treatment capacity.

Commuting Patterns

Unlike some of the other factors required by law to be used in determining the local shares of the region's existing and projected housing needs, commuting patterns are not explicity dealt with in the Projections 79 report. However, the distribution in the report of projected growth in jobs and housing throughout the region is based on certain key assumptions about the transportation network (as described in the preceding discussion on availability of suitable sites and facilities) and the concentration of jobs (covered in the previous discussion on employment opportunities). In addition, the issue of **commuting patterns** can be likened to the discussion on "jobs/housing balance" covered by the projections report.

The term "jobs/housing balance" refers to the ratio of jobs in a local area to housing units. In 1975, this ratio varied from a high of 1.65 in San Francisco to 0.69 in Marin County. Communities with a jobs/housing ratio greater than 1.1 imply net in-commuting; those with ratios less than 1.1 imply net out-commuting.

The jobs/housing balance issue does not imply that each community should necessarily reflect the regionwide ratio of jobs to housing, or that all workers should be employed in the community in which they live. Commuting across jurisidictional boundaries is an inherent feature of all large metropolitan areas, reflecting the economic and cultural diversity that make large urban regions viable. However, severe imbalances do lead to significant environmental problems and impose costs on localities, as well as the region as a whole.

Most of these effects can only be evaluated in a qualitative manner. Moreover, standards for reasonable" jobs/housing ratios are not known or defined precisely. Nevertheless, certain patterns were observed in the projections report:

- The ratio of jobs to housing units is projected to drop substantially in counties currently experiencing large amounts of net out-commuting, such as Contra Costa, Marin and Sonoma, implying greater amounts of out-commuting in the future.

- Solano County shows the largest projected decline in the ratio of jobs to housing, an indication that it will take more than a vast industrial land reserve to attract job growth away from more established urban centers.

- The ratio is expected to increase substantially in San Francisco, so that there would be nearly two jobs for every housing unit in the city.

- Ratios are expected to improve in Alameda, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, where established employment centers are well prepared to service more industry, and where housing growth has been somewhat more constrained by local policy than elsewhere in the region.

For purposes of this report, **commuting patterns are assumed to be adequately reflected by the assumptions used to develop the transportation network. It is further presumed that these patterns will be somewhat altered in the future and that these future patterns are reflected in the distribution of the growth in households in Projections 79, and the distribution of new employment as forecast by ABAG's current modeling system. The incremental (1980-1985) growth rates are used in the calculations to determine projected regional housing needs.**

Type and Tenure of Housing

AB 2853 requires councils of governments to consider type of housing (i.e., single-family detached and multi-family attached) and tenure (i.e., owner and renter) in the determinations of regional housing needs, and the local shares of those needs. In order to address this requirement, ABAG reviewed housing unit estimates of the Department of Finance to establish a 1980 baseline for both type and tenure of housing in the region.

For **type of housing**, ABAG used DOF 1980 information to determine the existing percentage split between single-family attached units and multi-family attached units. These estimates were made for each county, city and unincorporated area in the region. Since mobile home information is also estimated by DOF, ABAG considered the percentage of the total housing stock tht mobile homes comprise separately for every jurisdiction. Regionwide in 1980, single-family detached units represented about 61% of the total stock, while multi-family attached and mobile homes comprised about 36% and 3%, respectively. The estimates by type appear in tables in Appendix III.

For **tenure of housing**, Franchise Tax Board and Department of Finance information is used (as described in Appendix III) to estimate the 1980 proportions of rental and ownership housing. These proportions are used in

estimating the fraction of the 1980-1985 increase in available housing that should be rental units to maintain the 1980 fraction of rental stock by jurisdiction.

To summarize, then, type of housing is considered in the preparation of the determination of existing housing needs, but 1985 needs are not distributed according to type of housing. Tenure of housing is presented for projected regional and local housing needs to indicate what proportions of the increase in housing stock should be owner and renter to maintain the existing 1980 proportions in 1985.

Housing Needs of Farmworkers

The special needs of farmworkers was recognized in the first versions of the Statewide housing plan, so it should come as no surprise that these needs were singled out for attention in AB 2853 as one of the factors in distributing regional housing needs.

From the outset in this discussion, a clear distinction should be made between farmworker housing and rural housing. Compared to the housing of the total population, rural housing as a whole is slightly newer because of the relatively recent migration of more affluent people to rural areas. However, even as new migrants move to rural areas, often bidding up the price of land and of the existing housing stock, it becomes even more difficult for low-income rural households to better their housing situation.

Although there are housing needs for all people living in rural areas, the intent of this discussion is to describe how farmworker housing need is identified, and how this factor is used in the distribution of regional housing need. Addressing this particular aspect of housing need is required by provisions of AB 2853. In addition, as a group farmworkers are among the poorest people in California and the Bay Area.

The data on farmworker housing need is even more limited than it is for the general population. Hence, critical assumptions need to be made about how such needs should be identified and distributed. **These assumptions, and how they are used in the distribution of regional housing need, are described in Appendix III.**

Fair Share Allocation Plan

An assessment of regional housing need as described in this report should not be presented without a brief description of the "fair share allocation plan" developed under the 1977 Housing Element Guidelines by the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

The department adopted revised State housing element guidelines in 1977 to administer Section 65302(c) of the Government Code. These guidelines called for the development of a fair share allocation plan for the major housing market areas of the State. Section 6420 of the guidelines provided that the Department "shall...prepare or delegate preparation of...a fair share allocation plan."

Section 6424 "delegates" to councils of governments the voluntary assignment of preparing a fair share allocation plan for non-market rate housing, but specified that the Department "shall perform the housing needs allocation" plan if a council of governments did not complete such a plan. In other words, the 1977 guidelines provided councils of governments with the option of preparing a fair share plan.

In June 1978 the department asked ABAG for its schedule for the development of a fair share allocation plan for the Bay Area. ABAG staff informed the Department of ABAG's limited financial resources and existing planning priorities. These factors argued against ABAG's choosing to prepare a Bay Area fair share allocation plan. This position was formally adopted by the Regional Planning Committee of the Association in August 1978.

The department then began the process of preparing a fair share allocation plan for the region. The fair share allocation of non-market rate households was to be used by local governments in preparing and submitting to the department local housing elements under the 1977 guidelines. The department conducted a meeting in San Francisco to discuss data sources and methodology. After the meeting, department staff worked for two weeks at ABAG's offices to receive local government comments. Based on this work, the department issued a draft plan with fair share allocation percentages for all Bay Area communities. In the draft plan, the department noted:

> While we do not expect the final allocation will differ significantly from those presented, we wish to give each jurisdiction ample opportunity to offer suggestions and criticism. Allocations

> will be adjusted when it can be shown that there is a more reliable or accurate source of data which will yield results that differ significantly from what is contained in this draft.

A final allocation plan was never distributed to Bay Area communities, although the department did make some changes for certain communities' fair share allocations.

Guidelines Controversy

Since adoption of the housing element guidelines in 1977, there has been considerable controversy over the legal status of the guidelines. In part the controversy was over semantics. The guidelines were issued as regulations pursuant to State law that required the Department of Housing and Community Development to adopt regulations for local housing element guidelines. The controversy was whether such guidelines/regulations were "advisory" to local governments or could be construed to impose mandatory requirements on local governments because they were issued as regulations.

The department took the position that the guidelines were mandatory, thereby giving greater weight to the review and comment function the department performed with respect to housing elements. This assertion was at the heart of the controversy.

The Legislative Counsel was asked to give an opinion about the legal nature of the guidelines, and concluded in Opinion No. 9894 that, while the department had the legal authority to adopt regulations setting forth its guidelines for the preparation of local housing elements, these regulations were advisory to local agencies in the preparation of housing elements.

The Legislature enacted provisions in the Budget Act of 1979-80 preventing the department from expending State funds arguing in court that the guidelines were mandatory. The Second District Court of Appeals declared the advisory nature of the guidelines in the case of Bownds v. City of Glendale (1980), 113 Cal. App. 3d 875. The State Supreme Court early in 1981 decline to review the appellate court decision.

In another court action, however, [Camp v. Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County (1981), 123 Cal. App. 3d 334], the First District Court of Appeals, citing Bownds, noted that, "Regardless of whether these regulations were 'advisory' or mandatory in the preparation of a housing element for inclusion in a general plan...the court

properly resorted to them for the purpose of determining whether the County's housing element complied with section 65302...."

Section 65585 of the Government Code, enacted as part of AB 2853, declares the housing element guidelines to be advisory to local governments. However, many of the substantive points contained in the guidelines were added by the provisions of AB 2853 to the Government Code, thereby providing statutory rather than administrative guidance for the preparation of local housing elements. Chief among these requirements, as previously noted, is the requirement that local governments consider formally the regional housing needs determined by their respective councils of governments.

Housing Element Deadline Extension

AB 2853 required local governments to adopt housing elements by October 1, 1981. Local agencies were given a choice of how to do so: they could adopt a housing element conforming to the requirements of Article 10.6 of the Government Code, added by enactment of AB 2853, or they could adopt, under the 1977 guidelines, a housing element, which, if found adequate by the Department of Housing and Community Development, was deemed to be in conformity with the requirements of Article 10.6.

There were two problems associated with the deadline. The first was that, until August of 1981, the requirements for regional housing needs determinations by councils of governments could not have been called mandatory. ABAG and other COGs throughout the State had to ensure that the duties placed upon them by enactment of AB 2853 were reimbursable under provisions of Article XIIIB of the Constitution. COG eligibility for Revenue and Taxation Code reimbursement had to be accomplished by legislative action (enactment of AB 20 in July 1981); ABAG filed the required test claim to ensure reimbursement and the State Board of Control in August 1981 agreed that AB 2853 imposed new mandatory duties on COGs for which reimbursement is required. Based on that action, ABAG and other COGs could proceed with the work.

The second problem with the statutory deadline was that, since the beginning of the calendar year, many California communities attempted to conform to provisions of AB 2853 by adopting a housing element by October 1 under the 1977 guidelines. According to the department, because of the number of housing elements received for review, many could not be reviewed by the State in sufficient time to allow

cities and counties to consider the department's comments and revise and adopt their housing elements by October 1.

Because of the delays in settling the question of COG reimbursement and the number of housing elements submitted to the State for review, Assemblyman Roos, author of AB 2853, with the support of the department, California COGs, the League of California Cities and the building industry, tried to have legislation enacted to postpone the deadline for cities and counties, and to specify deadlines for COG need determinations. Unfortunately, this legislation was not enacted prior to the close of the 1981 regular legislative session.

Related Statutory Requirements

The provisions of AB 2853 should also be read in the context of other State legislation enacted in 1980. A brief description of these requirements is presented below.

Chapter 823 (Senate Bill 1656) of the Statutes of 1980 requires that a local agency amending its general plan or adopting an ordinance to limit the number of housing units to be constructed on an annual basis adopt findings "which justify reducing the housing opportunities of the region." The findings shall include a description of the city's or county's "appropriate share of the regional need for housing."

Chapter 1144 (Assembly Bill 3252) of the Statutes of 1980 amends the Evidence Code to presume the regional effects of ordinances that place numerical limits on building permits that may be issued, or buildable lots that may be developed for residential purposes. The burden of proof placed on local governments does not apply to temporary ordinances enacting growth moratoria, creation of agricultural preserves under the Williamson Act, or ordinances establishing minimum lot sizes. It also does not apply to voter-approved ordinances enacted prior to January 1, 1981 if such ordinances require a population growth rate of no more than the average growth rate experienced by the State as a whole.

Chapter 1152 (Assembly Bill 2320) of the Statutes of 1980 streamlines the process of approvals for residential construction. It also requires local governments to consider the effect of ordinances and actions under the Subdivision Map Act on the housing needs of the region.

Local governments are also required to zone land for residential uses "to meet the housing needs as identified in the general plan."

Use of Available Information

AB 2853 requires the use of available data in the determination of regional housing needs. The principle reason for this provision was so that councils of governments would not be required to undertake extensive data collection for the purposes of the analysis.

The Department of Housing and Community Development was required by AB 2853 to provide data for the determinations of regional housing need. On June 22, 1981, the the Department provided to ABAG and the other COGs county-level population and household projections through 1985 based on the 1980 Census and the interim Department of Finance projection series. The interim DOF projection series forecast a slightly higher regional population level than the previous DOF projection series E-150.

The E-150 projection series--used as the baseline series for Office of Planning and Research approval of COG projections--forecast a lower regional population level in 1980 than ABAG's Projections 79 and also a lower level than the 1980 Census. Projections 79 has been conditionally approved by OPR, and represents factors not considered in the State's forecasting process--employment growth, local development policy and distribution of growth below the county level. Consequently, Projections 79 is used to supplement and in some cases substitute for DOF data.

The other data provided by the Department was income proportions to be applied to the region's population. These proportions were based on the 1970 Census and updated to reflect income categories used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to distribute Federal housing assistance. Income figures from the 1980 Census are not yet available.

To the extent possible, ABAG has used other available information to perform the analysis presented in this report. This includes data already incorporated in ABAG's modeling system and data base, and information from the Department of Finance, the Department of Employment Development, the Franchise Tax Board, the State Savings and Loan Commissioner, and local agencies. The information sources are noted in Appendix III.

The data used in the report is limited but reliable. Where

the information is weak or less reliable than that used elsewhere in the analysis, the report states that fact for local government attention during the review process. Where special local information is available and reliable (and ABAG did not have it available during the initial production of its analysis, as documented here), ABAG can incorporate this information in the analysis, as described in in Section III of the report.

Comparison with Statewide Need for Housing

AB 2853 provides that, once the determination of regional housing need is made by a council of governments, the Department of Housing and Community Development may revise the determination of regional housing needs to ensure consistency with the statewide need for housing. Table II-2 compares the determinations presented in this report with the household information provided to ABAG by the Department of Housing and Community Development in June 1981.

TABLE II-2
COMPARISON OF HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION WITH
STATE ESTIMATE OF REGIONAL HOUSING NEED

County	1980-85 Projected Household Increase*	1985 Projected Increase in Housing Needed*	State Projected Household Increase**
Alameda	35,597	39,212	24,500
Contra Costa	39,812	42,756	42,400
Marin	6,289	7,516	6,800
Napa	4,469	4,687	3,100
San Francisco	7,307	12,042	800
San Mateo	12,071	13,142	19,700
Santa Clara	54,320	58,548	65,200
Solano	18,501	20,380	23,100
Sonoma	17,333	18,600	22,700
Region	195,699	216,883	208,300

* As calculated in this report.

** Estimated by Department of Housing and Community Development, June 22, 1981, based on interim Department of Finance population projections, April 1981.

APPENDIX III. BACKGROUND PAPER ON METHODOLOGY*

This appendix describes the technical approach used to calculate the existing and projected housing needs of the San Francisco Bay Area.

In this report, housing needs are calculated for each of the 92 cities and the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area. The housing need for each Bay Area jurisdiction consists of the following components:

- Existing Housing Need, 1980, which is also referred to as the "1980 housing production shortfall." This number is defined as the difference between the available stock that was produced in 1980 and the amount that should have been produced in each jurisdiction to meet demand.

  The "existing need" calculation should not be viewed as a production target. It serves merely as an "audit" of the severity of housing problems that existed in each jurisdiction of the region in 1980.

- Projected Housing Need, 1985, which is also referred to as the "needed increase in available housing." This number is defined as the amount of housing needed in 1985 to meet projected household growth and to keep the housing market in balance, minus the housing available in 1980. It incorporates the existing need.

- 1981-1985 Housing Replacement Need: This number is defined as the amount of housing needed to replace those units expected to be demolished or lost from the present stock for other reasons. If units are not lost, they obviously would not have to be replaced. Therefore, the replacement need should be viewed separately from the other calculations.

Rehabilitation needs are not estimated because, first, it is not required by AB 2853, and second, extensive new data would be needed and this is not permitted under AB 2853's stipulation that housing needs determinations be based on available data.

Projected need figures are distributed by income categories, based on estimated future increases in household incomes and present income distributions in each of the region's counties and cities. Farmworker housing is estimated by county for 1985 and these figures are not included in the projected housing needs.

* First printing, December 7, 1981.
Revised for second printing, December 15, 1981.

Principal Concepts and Variables Used to Develop the 1980 and 1985 Housing Needs

1. The year 1975 is used as the model or base year for housing market trend measurements. It is also selected because the data necessary for the housing needs analysis is available for that year. Market trends for 1975 to 1980 are measured and used in calculating the 1980 needs. Projected 1980-85 trends are used to calculate 1985 housing needs.

2. Available housing stock includes all occupied units plus those vacant units actually available for full-year occupancy. (Vacant units excluded are second homes, units awaiting demolition, and those used for seasonal and migrant housing).

The 1980 Census provided the number of total housing units but has not yet issued reports containing data on types of vacant units. Therefore, 1970 Census data provided estimates, by jurisdiction, of the proportion of total units that were actually available for full-year permanent occupancy.

3. The available vacancy rate is the proportion of available housing that was vacant in each jurisdiction in 1980. In other words, the number of households reported by the 1980 Census in a jurisdiction is subtracted from the estimated available stock; the result is divided by the estimated available stock to calculate the available vacancy rate.

4. An available vacancy rate of 4.5% is postulated as a regional goal. It is used as one of the factors in calculating the optimal vacancy rate for each city. Traditionally, ABAG and many other organizations have used a 5.0% vacancy rate as a goal for each local market area. Vacancy rates in many cities, however, have actually been higher than this figure, especially in those communities having a high proportion of rental housing. This report estimates that, by 1985, a 4.0% rate for the region, on average, would be sufficient to provide for a balanced housing market.

5. For each jurisdiction, a needed vacancy rate is calculated for 1980 and 1985. This is the rate that would be sufficient to bring each jurisdiction's housing conditions near equilibrium. It is calculated by adjusting the actual available vacancy rate (#3 above) to reflect such factors as employment growth, housing price increases, available land, etc. The method by which these and other factors are combined is described in detail on the following pages.

Existing Information and Limitations of Data

AB 2853 requires the use of available data in the determination of regional housing needs. The principal reason for this provision was so that councils of governments would not be required to undertake extensive data collection for the purposes of the analysis.

The Department of Housing and Community Development was required by AB 2853 to provide data for the determinations of regional housing need. The data provided by the Department to ABAG and the other COGs was county-level population and household projections through 1985 based on the 1980 Census and the interim Department of Finance projection series. The interim DOF projection series forecasts slightly higher regional population levels than the previous DOF projection series E-150.

The E-150 projection series--used as the baseline series for Office of Planning and Research approval of COG projections--forecasts a lower regional population level in 1980 than ABAG's Projections 79 and also a lower level than the 1980 Census. Projections 79 has been conditionally approved by OPR, and represents factors not considered in the State's forecasting process--employment growth, local development policy and distribution of growth below the county level. Consequently, Projections 79 is used to supplement and in some cases substitute for DOF data.

The other data provided by the Department was income proportions to be applied to the region's population. These proportions were based on the 1970 Census and updated to reflect income categories used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to distribute Federal housing assistance. Income figures from the 1980 Census are not yet available.

To the extent possible, ABAG has used other available information to perform the analysis presented in this report. This includes data already incorporated in ABAG's modeling system and data base, and information from the Department of Finance, the Department of Employment Development the Franchise Tax Board the State Savings and Loan Commissioner, and local agencies.

The data used in the report is limited but reliable. Where the information is weak or less reliable than that used elsewhere in the analysis, the report states that fact for local government attention during the review process. Where special local information is available and reliable (and ABAG did not have it available during the initial production of its analysis, as documented here), ABAG can incorporate this information in the analysis.

Basic Data and Data Sources

- Households in 1975 - Department of Finance/ABAG
- Households in 1980 - U.S. Census
- Households in 1985 - ABAG Projections 79/U.S. Census
- Total Housing in 1975 - Department of Finance/ABAG
- Total Housing in 1980 - U.S. Census
- Available Housing in 1980 - ABAG/U.S. Census
- Available Vacancy Rate in 1980 - ABAG/U.S. Census
- County Employment in 1975 - ABAG
- County Employment in 1980 - ABAG/Employment Development Department
- County Employment in 1985 - ABAG
- Employees per household - ABAG/Employment Development Department
- Residential Density - ABAG Projections 79
- Median Housing Values for 1975 and 1980 - ABAG/Northern California Real Estate Research Council/State Savings and Loan Commissioner
- Median Household Incomes for 1975 and 1980 - ABAG/U.S. Census

(Tables III-1 through III-32 contain principal data used in the needs determination and are located at the end of Appendix III. Additional information on primary data and estimating procedures can be made available on request.)

FORMULAS USED TO CALCULATE HOUSING NEEDS

1980 Existing Need Formulas:

$$a = \frac{(\ln hh_{80} - \ln hh_{75})^{.9}}{\ln ho_{80} - \ln ho_{75}}$$

$$b = \frac{\left[(\ln em_{co\,80} - \ln em_{co\,75})^{1.3}\right]^{ER}}{\ln ho_{80} - \ln ho_{75}} \times DR$$

$$c = \frac{\ln hv_{80} - \ln hv_{75}}{\ln hi_{80} - \ln hi_{75}}$$

$$fu = \frac{(a + b + c)}{30} - .1$$

$$fw = fu\left[\frac{RVR}{AVR_{80}}\right]$$

$$SHc = \frac{1}{1 + fw}$$

These three formulas are reduced to one for purpose of calculations:

$$SHc_{80} = \frac{AVR_{80}}{AVR_{80} + (a+b+c).0015 - .0045}$$

$$OVR = (AVR_{80})^{SHc}$$

$$SH_{80} = hh_{80}\,(1 + OVR_{80}) - ho_{80}$$

1985 Projected Need Formulas

$$a = \frac{hh_{85}}{hh_{80}}$$

$$b = \frac{\left[(em_{co\,85} \div em_{co\,80})^{1-\alpha_{co}}\right]^{.7} - 1}{(em_{R\,85} \div em_{R\,80})^{1-\alpha_R} - 1}$$

$$c = \frac{\dfrac{hv_{85} \triangle hv_{80}}{hv_{80} \triangle hv_{75}}}{\dfrac{hi_{85} \triangle hi_{80}}{hi_{80} \triangle hi_{75}}}$$

$$fu = \frac{a + b + c}{30} - .1$$

$$fw = fu\left[\frac{RVR}{OVR_{80}}\right]$$

$$SHc_{85} = \frac{1}{1 + fw}$$

These three formulas are reduced to one for purpose of calculations:

$$SHc_{85} = \frac{OVR_{80}}{OVR_{80} + (a+b+c)\ .0015 - .0045}$$

$$OVR_{85} = (OVR_{80})^{SHc_{85}}$$

$$SH_{85} = hh_{85}\,(1 + OVR_{85}) - ho_{80}$$

a = household growth ratio

b = employment growth ratio

c = housing value to income ratio

ln = log natural

ci = city

co = county

R = region

hh = households

ho = housing

hi = household income

hv = housing value

em = employment

ER = employment ratio

DR = density ratio

α = growth increment in workers per household

fu = unweighted variance coefficient

fw = weighted variance coefficient

AVR = Available vacancy rate

RVR = Regional vacancy rate (= 4.5%)

SHc = Shortfall coefficient

OVR = Optimal vacancy rate

SH = Shortfall: Existing Need or Projected Need

N.B.: All data entries are for city, unless subscript indicates "co" for county data or "R" for regional data.

Existing Needs Model

The Existing Needs Model is driven by three ratios, each of which measures the variance between rates of change over a period. Ratios are used to reflect relative change between the elements that influence vacancy rate change. A ratio of 1 indicates a balance between the change elements. The three ratios, which are combined to calculate an optimal vacancy rate in 1980, are given equal weight in the model. They are:

a) the growth in number of households relative to growth in the size of the housing stock;

b) increase in number of jobs relative to growth in size of the housing stock; and

c) change in housing prices relative to change in household income.

Ratio (a) is used to reflect the impact of household growth on the need for increased growth in the total housing stock. Implicit in this concept is the condition that if household growth in a community exceeds housing stock growth over a specified period of time, the vacancy rate would fall. The lower the vacancy rate at the beginning of the period, the greater will be the impact of further decline on overall housing market balance. For this reason, the household growth measure in the numerator is adjusted by a factor of 0.9, which has the effect of stating that for every new household added, 1.1 new housing units should be added to the stock (1/1.1 = 0.9.) In fact, between 1975 and 1980, households actually increased at a rate about 12% higher than did housing stock, resulting in an overall decline in the region's vacancy rate from 4.7% to 3.4%.

Ratio (b) is used to reflect the impact of job growth in an area on the need for housing. Implicit in this measure is the assumption that job growth and housing growth should move at relatively the same rate of change. This does not imply that for every additional job a new housing unit should be constructed, but rather that the variance between housing stock growth rates and employment growth rates should be minimal. The ratio numerator (job growth rate) is adjusted for the condition that workers per household in each community could substantially influence the need for additional housing. That is, as the number of workers per household of the existing resident population increases, the impact of job growth on the need for additional housing falls. This suggests that additional workers in households "absorb" the employment growth. This adjustment in the growth in jobs by resident workers per households implies that communities with more than one worker per household in 1980 could accommodate a portion of the job growth in the county without creating pressure for additional housing. In the equation, this adjustment factor is termed the "employment ratio," or "ER."

After the job growth is adjusted by the workers per household in each community for the forecast year, another adjustment in the job growth is made. Since skills vary from job to job and the resident labor force in each community contains a different mix of skills, it is necessary to adjust total job growth by a factor that considers the fact that inter-county commuting will occur because of the variance between resident labor force skills and the job opportunities in each county. In order to develop an estimate of an appropriate percentage of job growth that should be absorbed by each county we reviewed the 1970 Census for the percentage of resident workers in each county that worked in their county of residence. The percentages varied from a high of 83% in Santa Clara to a low of 49% in Marin. The regional average was 71.7%. Since it is a regional policy to minimize the jobs-housing imbalance and because using county specific data would require some counties to absorb more job growth than others, staff decided to use 70% as a regional average estimate of the job growth that each community should accommodate after the county job growth was adjusted by the workers per household. Finally, we divide this estimate by the actual housing stock growth between 1975-1980 to obtain a jobs-housing imbalance coefficient. A coefficient of 1.0 indicates that job growth has been accommodated by housing growth and inflationary pressures on housing production are minimized. Any number greater than 1.0 implies that adjusted job growth has occurred by some fraction greater than housing growth.

Because of the fact that not all communities have land available to accommodate the housing demand generated by the job growth that occurred in the county as a whole, a land availability factor is multiplied by the job-housing ratio, for a final adjustment. The land availability coefficient ranges from 1.0 to 0, and was developed by using local policy information in Projections 79. A 1.0 indicates that land constraints are minimal; a coefficient of 0.50 indicates that land constraints are twice as severe in the city as in the county as a whole. This coefficient is multiplied by the jobs-housing imbalance ratio to derive an adjusted calculation of the (b) ratio. Hence, a 0.5 would reduce the initial value by 50%.

Ratio (c) is used to measure the disparity in the growth in median housing prices in a community over the growth in median household income. If housing costs rise at a faster rate than personal household income, then households will be spending a higher proportion of their income for housing in the forecast year than they were in the base year. And since housing production affects the price of housing in terms of the speculative and profit increments, this factor would be used to measure the inflationary pressures associated with the cost of housing relative to the income ability of each community. A coefficient of 1.0 indicates that the proportion of income going into housing remained the same over the period under review. Any number greater than 1.0 indicates that housing costs were increasing at some rate greater than income, and therefore the proportion of income going into housing increased over the period.

Calculating the Needed Vacancy Rate

Assume that coefficient a = 0.9530; b = 3.91 and c = 1.909. Of these coefficients, (b) indicates that the job-housing imbalance is the greatest contributor to disequilibrium between housing demand and supply. That is, job growth is increasing at almost four times as fast as housing production. After calculating (a), (b) and (c), they are summed in the following manner:

$$f = \left[\frac{.9530 + 3.91 + 1.909}{30} - .1\right] \qquad (1)$$

Each coefficient is given equal weight in the formula. The sum (a) + (b) + (c) is divided by 30, and from that ratio, 0.1 is subtracted. If each coefficient is equal to 1.0 then the existing available vacancy rate is the needed rate and the housing need is zero. That is, if the sum of the ratios equals 3, then (3/30 - .1) equals zero variance. Also note that for the purposes of calculating 1980 short-fall only, a floor constraint is set such that: (a), (b), (c) $\geq$ 1.0 only. In the Production Goal formula, (a), (b), (c) $\geq$ 0.0. This implies that the 1985 forecast need vacancy rate can be less than the needed vacancy rate in 1980.

Now, the variance factor (f) equals (0.1257) in the example above. The larger a variance from zero implies a greater disequilibrium with respect to excess demand over supply. After calculating the variance factor, a weight is applied to adjust for a Regional Vacancy Goal Ratio. This ratio is used to adjust the difference between a jurisdiction's vacancy rate and the regional vacancy goal of 4.5% for all housing. Previously, ABAG has used a 5% vacancy goal, but because of market conditions, it is an unreasonable rate for the purposes of this analysis. The reciprocal of the ratio (jurisdiction vacancy rate/ Regional Goal vacancy rate) is a multiplier which is applied to the variance factor (f). The multiplier is used to minimize any potential bias against jurisdictions that may have high initial vacancy rates. Generally, these jurisdictions are older and have a higher proportion of units that are substandard. Since substandard units do not generally turn over as fast, they create artifically higher vacancy rates that

do not reflect actual demand in a jurisdiction for adequate housing. After multiplying the regional goal ratio by the variance factor, staff obtain a weighted variance from the optimal vacancy rate. That is,

$$0.1257 \left[\frac{1}{0.038/0.045}\right] = 0.14885. \quad (2)$$

Next, a coefficient of short-fall is calculated. This coefficient represents the deficiency that the existing vacancy rate must be adjusted by to obtain the optimal vacancy rate. If the local market was near equilibrium then the variance approaches 0.0. A short-fall coefficient of 1.0 equals the existing vacancy rate, and the short-fall is zero.

That is,

$$\frac{1}{1 + 0} = 1.0, \quad (3)$$

since $x^1 = x$

In this case, however, the short-fall coefficient is:

$$\frac{1}{1 + .14885} = .8704 \quad (4)$$

After calculating this coefficient, it is used to raise the existing rate to an optimal level by use of a power function. A power function (y^x) is used where: y = calculated vacancy rate and x = the short-fall coefficient. This function is used because it suggests mathematically a relationship that best measures severity of the housing short-fall and is not linear, but increases the upward movement of the optimal vacancy rate at an increasing rate as the coefficient of short-fall diverges from 1.0. As a measure of elasticity, for every 0.01 decline in the severity coefficient there is an approximate 4% decline in the available vacancy rate needed to move the market near equilibrium. Now, assume that the available vacancy rate in a community is .038 or 3.8% of the available housing stock. Let, ($0.038^{.8704} = .058$) which implies that the optimal vacancy rate should be closer to 5.8% as opposed to 3.8%. The difference between the two numbers implies a housing production short-fall.

As the final step in calculating the 1980 existing need figures, the optimal vacancy rate is multiplied by the number of households to calculate the total available housing needed. From that is subtracted the number of units calculated as available, and the remainder is the existing need.

Projections of Future Regional Housing Needs

The process used to forecast new housing units needed in 1985 is similar, but not identical, to that used in calculating the existing stock short-fall. (See formulas on page III-5.) Ratios (a), (b) and (c) are used as elasticity measures, as previously, but each is composed of somewhat different elements. Since housing stock is not available as an input to the weight used to calculate an optimal vacancy rate, the change in the number of households between 1980 and 1985 is used as a surrogate for the ratio of household growth to housing stock growth. For 1985, therefore, the three ratios are:

a) the number of households forecast in 1985 divided by the number of households in 1980;

b) the rate of change in county employment expected between 1980 and 1985, divided by the comparable rate for the region; and

c) the rate of change in housing values to the rate of change in household incomes, 1980 to 1985 and 1975 to 1980.

The three ratios for 1985 are combined and applied to the needed vacancy rate calculated for 1980 to obtain the rate needed in 1985. This permits the needed vacancy rates for 1985 to differ from those of 1980 depending on the following:

- land use constraints forecast to be in effect between 1980 and 1985.
- changing distribution and growth of employment between 1980 and 1985.
- changing distribution of incomes and housing values between 1980 and 1985.

This is critical because the rate takes into consideration the dynamics of the housing market over the forecast period. The needed vacancy rate in 1985 is applied to the 1985 forecast of households to obtain the optimal number of new units in 1985 to accommodate the growth in households in the region during that period. This estimate is not adjusted for expected or planned demolitions and units that, for the 1980-1985 period, can be estimated to be lost from the housing stock. Replacement for such losses is separately estimated, as described below.

Table A-1 summarizes the 1985 housing need for the region. County and city figures are presented in Tables C-1 through C-9.

Methods Used to Estimate Baseline Conditions and Trends

This section of Appendix III describes the sources of data used in calculating 1980 and 1985 housing needs. The tables at the end of this Appendix contain the principal data used in the calculations.

Where feasible, the estimates are provided for each incorporated city and town, and summed within unincorporated areas by county. Information from the 1980 Census provides for each county and incorporated cities and towns the number of persons in households, group quarters, and persons per household.

Housing stock data from Census publications were summarized for each incorporated area, for total unincorporated areas, and for each county. These data represent the total stock available for housing. They include second homes, abandoned homes, and vacant homes apparently not available for year-round occupancy. Hence, they represent a possible overestimate (or upper limit) of homes that are actually available in the supply for occupancy.

To correct for the net units available for occupancy, 1960 and 1970 Census housing data by city were reviewed. This allowed for a determination of the net available housing during those periods. The net figures exclude seasonal and migratory housing, occasional use housing, and other undefined exclusions.

From these data, a percentage was estimated for each city and county that covered any of the excluded categories. The 1970 proportion of available stock to total stock was applied to the 1980 housing stock to estimate the 1980 available stock.

Tables III-1 through III-9 summarize the population in households, the number of households, and the estimated housing stock available, by city, within each county for 1980. The 1985 household forecasts were developed using the 1980 Census households as a base. Projections 79, which forecasts households from 1980-2000, was used as the primary forecasting mechanism. The incremental rate of increase in households between 1980 and 1985 was used to forecast 1985 households from 1980 Census data. These growth increments were based upon local development policies in 1978-1979 and used as the basis to obtain the rates of growth in households between 1980-1985.

Employment

Employment estimates by county for 1980 were obtained by using data from the State Employment Development Department.

ABAG has recently updated and refined its methods for projecting growth in employment for the Bay Area. These methods are incorporated in a comprehensive regional demographic-economic forecasting model (DEECO), which was the source for the 1985 projected employment by county.

There are two basic features of the model not used previously in ABAG projections (e.g., Projections 79):

- It is driven by an input-output model of the economy of the Bay Area.
- It simultaneously forecasts regional population, regional jobs, regional migration and regional per capita income changes in constant 1977 dollars.

To estimate workers per household by city and unincorporated areas, ABAG staff used the following process. State EDD produces monthly estimates of resident employment by city and county in the region. In order to estimate workers per household, ABAG staff divided resident employment by the 1980 Census. These estimates were used for every county except Santa Clara, where county planning department data were used. 1985 county worker per household estimates were forecast by trending the change in workers per household between 1978-1980 to 1985, and adjusted.

The land availability coefficient was used to reflect the extent to which residential density in the city exceeds that of the county, in order to adjust the jobs-housing ratio, based on county employment data, according to the city's capacity to accommodate additional development. Land use data in ABAG's Projections 79 was used to calculate this "density ratio," which divides the resident population per developable acre in the entire county by resident population per developable acre in the city. If city density was higher than county, the jobs-housing ratio was adjusted downward accordingly. If the city density was lower than county, the "density ratio" was set at 1.0 and the jobs-housing ratio was unchanged.

Table III-10 shows county employment for 1975 and 1980, and 1985 projected employment forecast by ABAG's DEECO model. These employment figures are used in the calculations, as noted.

Housing Values and Household Incomes

Housing values for each jurisdiction were estimated for 1975 and 1980 based on data from the Real Estate Research Council of Northern California and the State Savings and Loan Commissioner. The Real Estate Research Council (RERC-NC) report on market trends summarizes information on appraised values of a sample of single-family residential properties and on comparable market price trends since 1967. The State Savings and Loan Commissioner's (S&L) data on residential real estate transactions, by Census tract, for each year 1977 through 1980, were processed to provide mean and median prices for each locality, county, and the "survey areas" defined by the RERC-NC.

The next step was to calculate the mean market value for homes in the region as a whole and for each of four "survey areas." The third step in the procedure was to adjust each county mean, provided by the S&L data, to the level shown in the RERC-NC data. This was done in order to take account of the concerns that the S&L transaction data do not accurately reflect current market values for the entire housing supply, whereas the RERC-NC data are based on a sample survey designed to represent the total supply. In some areas, S&Ls are involved only in sales of moderate priced homes, whereas in other areas the data seemed to reflect a preponderance of sales of high priced homes. On the other hand, the S&L data were far more extensive and detailed as to geographic area than that provided by RERC-NC. The adjustment was made by multiplying the mean for each county (from S&L data) by a ratio comparing the survey area mean derived from RERC-NC with the survey area mean derived from S&L.

A similar ratio mechanism was used to estimate the 1975 mean value for each county. The RERC-NC trend data were used to construct a ratio, for each survey area, of the 1975 and 1977 values, and these were multiplied by the appropriate 1977 county means to get 1975 estimates. These estimated housing values for each of the nine counties were then used to adjust the S&L data for each of the region's 92 cities and 8 unincorporated county areas, again by using ratios. The adjusted county housing value was multiplied by a ratio of city to county mean housing value for 1975 and 1980. The S&L data were used to derive a final set of ratios of median to mean values; and these were multiplied by the appropriate means to calculate adjusted median house values for each locality.

Median household incomes for 1980 and 1975 were estimated in the following manner. Per capita income estimates for the years 1975-1977 by city were taken from the document Population Estimates and Projections, P-25 Series (1977 Per Capita Income Estimates). In order to forecast per capita income to 1980, ABAG staff used per capita income forecasts by county for 1977-1979 from the publication Survey of Current Business, April 1981. 1980 estimates were extrapolated based upon the trend between 1977-79. Next, 1977 city levels were forecast at the same rate to obtain 1980 per capita income data. The 1980 per capita income by city was multiplied by 1980 Census household size to obtain 1980 mean household income. The same procedure as above was

used to estimate 1975 household income with DOF household size estimates. Since housing prices are in median values, household income was adjusted to median levels by use of median and mean income data found in the S&L data tape.

The 1985 median housing prices and median household income were forecast by using data gathered through a delphi process, described below.

Estimating Future Increases in Incomes and Housing Values

Because ABAG staff members were concerned that important assumptions about changes in housing values and incomes should be carefully made, a panel of experts in housing finance and economics was convened. This panel was selected to make the income and housing value estimates for this analysis, using a well-known technique called the "Delphi approach."

The Delphi approach can be generally defined as a systematic technique for soliciting group opinion. Delphi surveys involve concise communication and, therefore, the participants must be highly familiar with the subject matter. A Delphi survey is most effective when the participants are all experts in the sense that they are knowledgeable and communicate an entire body of thought with few words. The essential features of the Delphi survey include:

- Iteration with Controlled Feedback--the panel interaction is carried out through responses to a series of questionnaires. Extracted from the responses is that information relevant to the issues; this information is then fed back to the panel, but not in such a way as to overwhelm the opposition by weight of repetition.

- Statistical Group Response--the response of the panel is fed back in statistical terms so that the degree to which differences of opinion exist is accurately portrayed, in addition to the median response; in this way all responses are considered.

- Anonymity--the identity of the panelists and their interactions are handled in an anonymous fashion through the use of questionnaires; specific opinions or responses are **not** identified with a particular person.

ABAG staff convened the Delphi panel for this analysis early this fall. Three rounds of questionnaires were used, and the results tabulated. The median estimated annual percentage increases in the Consumer Price Index, used to calculate increases in incomes from 1980 to 1985, were 10, 9.2, 8.4, 8.1 and 7.7. The median estimated annual percentage increases in housing values were 9.8, 9.9, 9, 8.9 and 9.1 for the five-year period. The five-year cumulative increases were 51.6 percent for changes in the CPI and 56.3 percent for housing values.

Income Levels and Distribution of 1985 Needs

This subsection of Appendix III describes how the projected housing need for each jurisdiction was distributed by household income levels. As defined [Section 65584(a) of the California Government Code], a locality's share of the regional housing needs includes "that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by a jurisdiction's general plan."

Therefore ABAG is required to estimate household income levels and take this into account in defining each locality's share of the regional housing need. The procedure used to estimate income and to distribute the regional housing needs involved many steps. These steps are summarized below.

1. As previously described, the 1985 median household income was estimated for each county.

2. The median income for **each county** was adjusted on the basis of the proportion of taxpayers filing singly and jointly in 1979.

3. The income level analysis proceeded from this point on the basis of estimated county median incomes for joint return households only. ABAG staff believed that this more accurately reflected the capability of households to purchase housing, and to have data compatible with that of the Commissioner of Savings and Loan--the only data available to estimate city median incomes.

4. From the Commissioner's transactions data ABAG staff calculated a median household income for each city and county. The ratio of city median to county median was multiplied against the county median calculated in Step 3 above to obtain an estimated **city** median income.

5. The next step was sets up income level categories for each jurisdiction. This was done using levels commonly applied by Federal, State and other agencies. These are very low (50% of median income, adjusted for household size); low (51-80% of median income, adjusted for household size); moderate (81-120% of median income, adjusted for household size); and above moderate (the remainder of the population).

Because each county has a unique median household income and income distribution, the ranges established for the income categories vary. As shown in **1985 dollars**, the upper limits of the ranges for very low, low, and moderate income categories are listed below. Households with

incomes above the upper limit for the moderate income category are above moderate.

	Median	Moderate (81-120% of median)	Low (51-80% of median)	Very Low (50% of median)
Alameda	$31,058	$37,270	$24,846	$15,529
Contra Costa	35,759	42,911	28,607	17,880
Marin	42,780	51,336	34,224	21,390
Napa	25,946	31,135	20,757	12,973
San Francisco	25,922	31,106	20,738	12,961
San Mateo	37,018	44,422	29,614	18,509
Santa Clara	34,772	41,726	27,818	17,386
Solano	27,356	32,827	21,885	13,678
Sonoma	30,959	37,151	24,767	15,480

7. After calculating the cutoff points identified in the step above, the housing model calculates the distribution of city income and compares the distribution to the countywide cutoff points. Next, it provides an estimate of the percentile in each city relative to the county income categories. The upper limit for the moderate percentile is subtracted from 100% to obtain the percentage above moderate income. The sum of the very low and the low incomes is subtracted from the upper limit to obtain the moderate income estimate. For example, in the City of Berkeley in 1985 approximately 10% of the households are estimated to have an income of $15,000 or less, and 19% are estimated to have an income of $25,000 or less. This means that 9% of the households will fall in the low income range, but not the very low. Similarly, 17% will fall in the moderate category, and 64% of the new households are estimated to be above moderate income. The percentages only apply to the new households because it is assumed that existing households have shelter.

8. Based on these estimated percentages, the 1985 needed increase in available housing for each jurisdiction was divided among the income categories.

The resulting numbers from the procedure described above **do not** imply that each jurisdiction must produce the identified amount of very low, low, moderate and above moderate housing. Instead, the identified amount in each income category implies only that a specific number of units should be available for occupancy by people at the four income levels. To make the assumption that the 1985 number means a community must construct the identified amount of housing units for each income category would be incorrect. A community can make additional housing

opportunities available by a number of means. Included among these are by "filtering," by allowing large single-family homes to be converted into multi-family use; by rehabilitating substandard units or units presently scheduled for demolition; or by constructing low- and moderate-income housing units.

This section of AB 2853 stresses that the distribution of regional housing needs should "seek to avoid" further impaction of communities with relatively high proportions of lower income residents. The method described does this because it makes no community worse off in 1985 than it was in 1980. This is how ABAG staff interpreted the meaning of "seek to avoid further impaction."

An alternative approach would have been to apply straight percentages for all income groups to all communities. This method would be less defensible than the method used for this report.

Tenure of Housing

ABAG is required to consider tenure of housing--that is, rental and ownership housing--in its determination of regional housing needs and each locality's share of these needs. Tenure of housing is a difficult subject to consider, particularly when dealing with **future** housing stock.

For this report, the 1980 distribution of owner and rental housing was estimated by jursidiction. Franchise Tax Board data for 1979 renters' credits was obtained for each county. The 1979 percentage of renters in a county was estimated. The percentage rate was assumed to remain constant in 1980 for each county. Next, regionwide assumptions were applied to the Department of Finance structure type information for 1980.

First, it was assumed that two thirds of all 2-4 unit structure types were occupied by renters, although in San Francisco this fraction was assumed to be one half. Second, it was assumed that structures containing 5 or more units were entirely occupied by renters. Then, based on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's 1979 annual housing survey, which indicates that 12% of all mobilehomes are occupied by renters, the number of renters occupying mobilehomes was determined by multiplying the DOF mobilehome estimates by in a county by 12%.

The numbers derived were then used to estimate the percentage of single-family detached homes occupied by renters. While the percentage of renter units was applied to the categories of 2-4 units, 5 or more units and mobilehomes for each Bay Area county, the estimated percentage of single-family detached homes occupied by renters varied from county to county. This occurred because the estimate is based on the numbers derived from the other three estimates subtracted from the known 1979 Franchise Tax Board-reported number of renters in each county. The remainder from the subtraction was assumed to reside in single-family detached housing.

Once the rental percentages were determined at the county level, they were applied **uniformly** to each city and the unincorporated areas to give an estimate of the percentages of DOF total housing stock estimates. These derived percentages for 1980 were applied to the 1985 estimated increases in available housing. This information is presented in Tables D-1 through D-10. The procedure assumes that the proportion of rental stock to total housing in 1980 in each jursidiction would be maintained in 1985. It should be stressed that the resulting number

of rental units in 1985 is the number of **available** rental units needed in 1985 to maintain the 1980 proportion of rental housing. The numbers derived from this procedure **do not** imply that each jurisdiction needs to have constructed the derived additional rental units by 1985. The figures shown in the tables only imply that to maintain the 1980 status of rental to owner housing, a certain number of rental units need to become available by 1985.

Farmworker Housing

As noted previously, one factor to be considered in the distribution of regional housing need is the housing needs of farmworkers. This subsection of Appendix III describes how farmworker housing needs are considered in the distribution of projected housing needs.

The State Employment Development Department (EDD) annually estimates the total agricultural employment in 42 of the State's counties; two Bay Area counties (Marin and San Francisco) do not meet EDD's qualifications as significant agricultural employment counties. EDD estimates there were approximately 21,680 workers employed in agriculture in 1980. This number includes farmers and members of their families who are umpaid; regular and seasonal hired domestic workers; and agricultural workers brought to California under contract from outside the United States. This last category of worker has contained no workers since termination of the bracero program by then-Governor Ronald Reagan in 1967.

Regionwide, there as been a 0.5% decline in agricultural employment since 1975. However, the decline has been 14.1% since 1970, and by more than 50% from its 1950 level of 45,770. Santa Clara County alone accounted for 45% of the 1950-1980 decline. The decline in this sector's employment slowed by 1975, so that the five-year loss (1975-1980) was only 100 jobs.

Loss of agricultural employment from 1970 to 1980 ranged from a low of 1.8% in San Mateo to a high of 62.3% in Contra Costa County. However, while there have been losses in agricultural employment in the Bay Area and many of its counties, there have also been increases in this sector's employment in Napa, Solano and Sonoma Counties. The increase was most notable in Napa County (with an increase of 73.9%). This increase can be attributed largely to the growth experienced in viticulture.

Farmers and Unpaid Family. The number and percentage of farmers and unpaid family workers have both declined during the past 10 years. Overall, there has been a decline of 40.5% in this cateogy, with declines of 68.6% in Alameda County, 81.8% in Contra Costa County, 55.1% in Napa County, 24.8% in Santa Clara County, 23.7% in Solano County, and 8.1% in San Mateo County. Only Sonoma County (3.6%) showed an increase in the number of farmers and unpaid family workers.

Regular and Seasonal Hired Domestic Workers. Decreases in the number of regular and seasonal hired domestic workers regionwide was only 3.1% during the 1970-1980 period.

However, Contra Costa 42.2%), Alameda 38.6%), Santa Clara (18.9%) and San Mateo (0.5%) Counties all showed declines. Sonoma (1.3%) and Solano (19.7%) both had increases.

However, the most significant increase in regular and seasonal hired domestic workers was in Napa County, which experienced a 200% increase in this category of workers. This percentage is even more significant when combined with the 55.1% decrease in the number of farmers and unpaid family workers that occurred during the same period.

Background on Farmworker Housing Needs. As noted above, counties that have experienced increases in agricultural employment (i.e., Napa, Solano and Sonoma) are the same counties that have experienced an increase in the number of regular and seasonal hired domestic workers. It is the regular and seasonal hired domestic workers that constitute the farmworker population.

Complete date on the specific housing needs of farmworkers is not available from the 1980 Census, and the surveys done by EDD do not cover all farmworkers. In 1976, farmworker families were estimated to have an average annual income of less than $6,000 statewide. Furthermore, studies have found that large farmworker families live in substandard housing, overpay for the housing they do live in, and live in overcrowded and deteriorated shanties and labor camps.

As is the case for most low-income households, the housing needs of farmworkers far exceed governments' ability to provide assistance. The Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) is the most important provider of permanent housing for farmworkers, but FmHA assistance suffers from its own income qualifying standards and a shortage of staff and funds. Other providers of farmworker housing are the State Department of Housing and Community Development and the Office of Migrant Services of the State Employment Development Department (this office operates migrant centers throughout the State).

Because farmworkers are of low-income and their employment status is often tenuous, they are often unable to compete for housing on the open market. In addition, because most farmworkers share a culture and language that is often different from the communities in which they work, they are often discriminated against in the housing market. Again, as is the case for low-income families in urban areas, farmworker families have difficulty securing adequate shelter.

Even among the broader farmworker population, there are

different groups, each with its own housing problems. Regular or year-round farmworkers comprise about 60% of the farmworker population in the Bay Area. Regular farmworkers are those employed for more than 150 days annually. Their incomes are generally higher than seasonal workers, although most are unable to obtain affordable ownership or standard rental housing.

Seasonal and migrant seasonal workers represent about 40% of the farmworker population. Seasonal workers are generally local residents who depend heavily on finding employment in the agriculture industry to support their families. Migrant seasonal workers are those who travel more than 50 miles across county lines to obtain agricultural employment. Because of their constant travel and movement, the housing needs of these workers is most severe. As a consequence, these workers often take what they can get in terms of housing, which results in these workers living in substandard, overcrowded conditions.

A 1975 study by Self-Help Enterprises found that Statewide trends and projections indicated a stabilization of the agricultural work force. Another of the study's findings was the projection of a gradual decline of seasonal farmworkers as a result of increased demand for year-round workers. This last finding is somewhat borne out by the experience of the Bay Area. In 1970, 44% of the agricultural work force was seasonally employed. This percentage declined to 42% in 1975 and 40% in 1980.

A 1976 survey done of Yolo County farmworkers found that year-round and permanently located farmworker families had an average annual income of $7,000. The same survey found that seasonal migrant workers earned an average family income of approximately $5,000.

Although the above-mentioned study and survey are dated, both illustrate the plight of farmworkers. Their lack of adequate shelter is based primarily on their low-income status. The housing that is available to farmworkers is oftentimes substandard and located in areas of a community lacking in adequate services. Because of their low incomes, farmworkers often overpay for substandard housing and live in overcrowded conditions. In addition, because of their low-income status, and the prevalence of cultural and language differences, farmworkers are often isolated from the mainstream of a community.

Determining the Housing Needs of Farmworkers. Because there is a general lack of reliable data on farmworker housing needs, the following method is recommended by ABAG staff in estimating the housing needs of farmworkers.

1. The number of regular and seasonal hired domestic workers (i.e., farmworkers) regionwide is assumed to remain constant through the year 1985. That present figure is 17,260 workers. This figure only slightly decline from 17,290 workers in 1975, a 0.2% decline.

2. The percentage decline or increase that has occurred since 1975 in each county will be applied to each county's 1980 number of farmworkers. As a consequence, the counties that showed declines in their farmworker populations during 1975-1980 are assumed to decline by the same percentage during 1981-1985. Those counties declining were: Alameda (1.5%), Santa Clara (2.1%), Contra Costa (11.9%) and Sonoma (12.7%). These same counties are projected to have the greatest inrease in residential and other types of development during the 1981-1985 period.

Similarly, those counties showing an increase in the number of farmworkers during 1975-1980 are assumed to increase by similar percentages during 1981-1985. Those counties showing increases were: Solano (1.7%), San Mateo (2.2%) and Napa (35.1%).

3. Since farmworkers have traditionally been of lower incomes, the assumption is made that **all** farmworkers are of low income. As a consequence, farmworkers will be considered as part of the total low-income housing need of a community.

4. Probably the most significant assumption is that **all farmworkers live in unincorporated communities and areas of each county.** The major reason for this assumption is that employment data for farmworkers is only available at the county level. Another important reason for this assumption is that, in terms of total employment, farmworkers comprise 0.7% of the total Bay Area labor force in 1980. By county, farmworkers comprise the percentages of total county employment as shown in Table III-21.

Although the percentages differ significantly among Bay Area counties, there is no available information to assist in determining the distribution of these households into incorporated and unincorporated areas. Local governments should carefully examine, in their review of this report, how farmworkers housing needs are distributed within their jurisidictions.

5. The final assumption is also based on employment. Because of the nature of farmworker employment, labor force participation rates per household are significantly higher that other forms of employment. Often, whole families work in the fields during the prime harvest

seasons. Coupled with this is the changing tenure of farmworker laborers as farm operations gradually change from seasonal to year-round as the need for a more stable, permanent labor supply increases. In addition, despite the low educational attainment levels of most adult farmworkers, farmworker parents are increasingly realizing the value of education for their children. As a result of these forces, it is assumed in this report that the labor force participation of farmworker families is 1.75 workers per household.

The rate listed above takes into consideration the traditional family participation in the fields, the shifting needs of farm operations, and an increasing attendance at both regular and migrant schools on the part of farmworker family children.

Applying the 1.75 labor force participation rate to the 1980 number of farmworkers by county, and assuming the same increases and decreases in the farmworker population results in the farmworker housing needs by county shown in Table F-1. These farmworker housing needs are part of the low-income housing needs for the unincorporated portion of each county. However, since we do not know the employment split between year-round farmworkers and seasonal workers, the housing needs of seasonal workers are for units that may be unavailable for year-round occupancy, and therefore they are not included in the 1985 projected housing need.

Replacement of Existing Housing

Projecting the need for housing unit construction to accommodate the growth in households expected is only one factor in determining the projected need for housing. The other major component of housing need is for replacement of units estimated to be lost in the stock for the forecast period (that is, through 1985). Losses in the housing stock occur through planned demolitions, conversions to non-residential uses (e.g., converting an upper-floor unit to commercial office space), and non-planned losses from fires, floods, earthquakes and other natural phenomena.

The numerous methods used to estimate housing stock loss have inherent limitations--largely because of deficiencies in the available data. The 1970 Census did not collect data on the physical condition of housing. Therefore 1960 Census data is used in many studies to describe the conditions of the housing stock.

According to the 1977 California Statewide Housing Plan, local surveys and the Census Bureau studies on Components of Inventory Change (CINCH) conducted in the Los Angeles-Long Beach and San Francisco-Oakland SMSAs indicated that the proportion of the stock needing replacement has increased since 1960. In the two SMSAs, the proportion of older housing was comparable in 1960 and 1970. However, in both, the proportion of dilapidated housing was higher in December 1970 than in 1960, according to the unpublished CINCH studies, as cited in the 1977 State housing plan. Therefore, the authors of the State plan concluded, "...it is considered that the 1960 data represent conservative estimates of replacement and rehabilitation needs except in locations where the proportion of older housing has declined." Replacement rates used in the State plan are shown in Table III-22; the 1979 update of the plan estimated a replacement need for the region of 62,700 units as of July 1978.

Beause of deficiencies in the available data, this Housing Needs Report presents four ways of estimating the number of units that should be built to replace potential losses in the housing stock. These methods present the replacement need in 1985 to reflect losses in stock for the period 1980 to 1985. **Two of the four use age of housing stock to allocate county replacement estimates to jurisdictions within the county.** This means calculating the city's share of the county replacement, based on the city's fraction of the county's housing stock that, in 1970, was 30 years old or older.

A second convention used in the first two methods present

is to allocate the replacement units for seven jurisdictions (all cities that the 1970 Census did not separately report housing stock age) based on each city's share of the 1980 housing stock for the applicable county. These cities are Clayton and Hercules in Contra Costa County; Calistoga and Yountville in Napa County; Colma and Foster City in San Mateo County; and Rohnert Park in Sonoma County.

Finally, as noted below, ABAG staff recommend using the fourth method to calculate the replacement units.

Regional Housing Plan Rehabitation Estimates

The 1978 Regional Housing Plan contained quantified goals for housing rehabilitation. The targets contained described the level of rehabilitation activity estimated to be necessary to correct all "substandard housing" in the Bay Area by 1985.

In 1976-1977, the Housing Assistance Plans prepared by Bay Area local governments in applying for Community Development Block Grant funds estimated there existed about 137,000 housing units in "substandard" physical condition. Of that total, approximately 101,000 were considered by local governments as "suitable for rehabilitation." These plans were not prepared by individual local governments using consistent definitions of the physical condition of housing stock. However, these plans estimated that more than 90 percent of the Bay Area's stock in 1977 was considered in "standard" physical condition--that is, requiring little or no major repair. This stock needs continuous maintenance and repair if it is to remain safe and habitable. That fraction of the stock that is suitable for rehabilitation should also be repaired, or it will be lost from the existing stock at some point. It is not possible to quantify the potential from such losses at this tiime.

Assuming rehabilitation activity takes place, however, the more than 36,000 units that were considered unsuitable in 1976-1977 to rehabilitate are expected to be lost from the housing stock at some indeterminate point in the future (again, it is not possible to quantify the degree of rehabilitation of such units that might have taken place since 1977 given the changing feasibility of rehabilitation activity vis a vis demolition and replacement). Thus, one method for determining replacement need is to assume replacement of all units determined in 1977 to be unsuitable for rehabilitation.

These estimates are presented by county in Column 2 of

Tables III-23 to III-32. The estimates are further disaggregated to city by assuming that the units are evenly distributed within counties based on each cities fraction of the applicable county's housing stock more than 30 years old in 1970.

Regional Housing Plan Replacement Estimates

Also used in the development of the Regional Housing Plan was a calculation of projected losses in the Bay Area's housing stock based on the concept of **planned demolition** rates. The previous ABAG estimates were for the 1975-1985 period. For the purposes of this report, these projections were reexamined for consideration in estimating the 1985 replacement need for losses in the stock that might occur between 1980 and 1985.

The method used in calculating replacement units for the 1978 Regional Housing Plan was based on two important assumptions about future changes in the existing housing stock. The first was that the rate of demolition (i.e., demolition permits issued as a percentage of "older" housing units over a five-year period) during the 1970-1975 period would continue through 1985. The second was that the "loss" of housing units occurs only among housing stock that is at least 30 years old. Therefore, in performing the calculations, it was necessary to determine the appropriate demolition rates and "age" the 1975 housing stock through 1985.

Each year the Census Bureau reports demolition permit activity for counties and large cities. Demolition permits for the years 1970 through 1973 were used to calculate an average estimate for the five-year period, and the number of permits issued in each county was divided by the number of housing units built in 1939 or earlier (i.e., the number of "older" housing units that existed in 1970, according to the Census). The resulting percentage became the county "demolition rates" for older housing used in the projection of demolitions through 1985.

The number of older units existing at the end of each five-year period during the projection was determined by aging the stock. The number of housing units were organized by the year the structures were built: (1) 1939 or earlier, (2) 1940 to 1949, and (3) 1950 to 1959. County demolition rates were applied to the "older" housing figures to determine how many units were lost during the five years. The loss was then subtracted from the previous total. For units built in 1940-1949 and 1950-1959, it was assumed that there was an even

distribution of units built in all years of the two decades. This assumption was made to allow half of the units to fall into the "older" housing category during the first half of a relevent decade, and hence, have the demolition rates applied to that half. Thus, for example, half the units built in 1940 to 1949 were assumed to be 30 or more years old. In 1980, all units remaining in that age category were classified as "older" units.

The resulting figures were then used to present, by county, an estimate of the replacement need. These figures were included in the construction goals calculation for the Regional Housing Plan. It would be possible to use the 1980-1985 county figures in the needs determinations. The county figures would be allocated to the cities by assuming that the replacement units would be distributed according to the city's fraction of the county's housing stock that was 30 years old or older in 1970. This method of calculating replacement need would result in the figures shown in Column 3 of Tables III-23 to III-32. However, using this method would necessarily assume agreement with the more critical of the two basic assumptions underlying the earlier calculation--**namely that the demolition rates should be applied constantly over the entire 1970-1985 period.**

Given present information, it would be difficult in 1981 to accept the assumption that the demolition rates associated with the early 1970s are likely to occur through 1985. Given present economic conditions, it may be more feasible to rehabilitate a structure than to tear it down and replace it (among the factors to be considered in making such decisions are permit processing time, permit fees, labor costs, availability of materials, and estimated length of rehabilitation activity). In addition, demolition rates in certain areas of the region in the early 1970s reflected substantial rehabilitation of neighborhoods or downtown areas and highway construction not now present, nor likely to recur in the 1980s. Losses in stock because of planned demolitions, then, are not likely to occur at the same rate in the later portion of the 1970-1985 period as they did in the early portion of the period. The question, then, is: **What rate should be assumed to estimate removal of housing from the 1980 housing stock?**

The Statewide Housing Plan Replacement Method

Another way of estimating replacement need would be to apply the county **removal** rates assumed in the development of the State housing plan to the housing stock information. The State plan calculated a removal rate

based on changes in the housing stock between 1970 and 1975. Removals were pro-rated over a five-year period, and an annual average removal rate was computed. The authors of the State plan, however, set an upper and lower limit on the rates used--a maximum of 1.0% per year and a minimum of 0.4% per year. "Exceptionally high actual removal rates in some counties may have reflected removals for public works such as highways or urban renewal projects that are not likely to recur in these counties during the period 1976 through 1981. On the other hand, removal rates lower than 0.4% are not likely to accompany the projected construction levels."

Table III-22 shows the removal rates assumed in the State plan for Bay Area counties. These removal rates were designed to be applied to the entire stock of housing. The table also shows the estimated replacement needs, as of July 1978, as shown using these removal rates from the 1979 update of the Statewide Housing Plan.

Applying the same removal rates calculated for the 1970-1975 period to the entire 1980 housing stock for the 1980-1985 period is the third method presented to calculate replacement need. This method means beginning with the 1980 number of available housing units by juridiction and removing a portion of the stock each year based on the applicable county removal rate. For the purposes of this analysis it is also assumed that there will be no additions to the stock during the 1980-1985 period, and thus the number of removals is calculated on a declining base each year. The results are shown in Column 4 of Tables III-23 to III-32.

1985 Replacement Needs

For purposes of this report, ABAG staff recommends rejecting the three previously described methods of calculating replacement. Instead, staff recommends that replacement need for 1985 be estimated using two assumptions:

- That the rates of loss in the housing stock from 1980 to 1985 will be one-half the rates of loss as calculated by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. These results are shown in the second column of Tables G-1 through G-9.

- That as housing value increases between 1980 and 1985, rehabilitation of existing substandard units will become more feasible economically, and these units will not be lost from the stock during

the 1980-1985 period. These results are shown in the third column of Tables G-1 through G-9.

The first assumption is made based on actual removal activity in the Cities of Oakland and San Francisco, two Bay Area jurisdictions where substantial removal activity occurred during the 1970s--much of it due to freeway construction and redevelopment activity. In the City of Oakland, for example, losses in the housing stock during the first five years of the 1970s averaged more than 580 units annually. During the last five years of the 1970s, annual losses in the stock averaged 233 units.

In San Francisco from 1977 to 1980, private demolitions averaged 110 units a year, according to estimates of the City Planning Department staff. Public and private demolitions together have averaged only about 137 units annually. Conversions of residential units to other uses has averaged only about 100 units annually during the 1970s.

The second assumption is made because of the increased interest on the part of residents in many cities to rehabilitate the existing housing stock, particularly in historic neighborhoods. The assumption also reflects the changing nature of housing rehabilitation because of the economy; in many cases it is much economical to rehabilitate a structure than to tear it down and replace it, unlike the early 1970s.

Therefore, for purposes of the Housing Needs Report's estimates of 1985 replacement need, it is assumed that the rate of replacement need will also decline as a changing function of the rate of increase in housing values between 1980 and 1985. For purposes of analysis, the housing value increases used in projecting 1985 housing need associated with growth, as described earlier in this section, are assumed in calculating the change in rehabilitation feasibility. In other words, the growth in housing values estimated by the Delphi panel (59.57% for the five-year period) is used to deflate the rate of removals in the existing 1980 stock beyond the level calculated by the first assumption that the rate of removal in each county will decline by 50%.

The method described above is technically defensible and consistent when applied across the Bay Area's cities and counties. But it is necessarily limited by the data available. City and county estimates should be carefully reviewed by local governments and adjusted where local or specialized information is available to support such revisions. **The estimates are not calculated in the increase in available housing in Tables G-1 through**

G-9 **because it cannot be assumed that these units will, in fact, be lost from the housing stock between 1980 and 1985.** In terms of interpretation, if the units estimated as replacement need are not lost from the stock, they would not be subtracted from estimates of housing stock available in 1985. If local agencies actually expect such losses to occur, production goals should include replacing them.

Housing Type

As noted, type of housing is one factor to be used by councils of governments in determining regional housing needs and each city and county share of such needs. ABAG used Department of Finance data to estimate the distribution of Bay Area housing by type. Tables III-11 through III-20 summarize the percent distribution of housing types by jurisdiction.

ABAG considered many alternatives in developing estimates of housing type. One method involved reviewing income and housing value information and estimating structure type by housing values in each community. This had many technical shortcomings. One of the shortcomings was that an allocation of structure type would have to be made based on projected housing value. In other words, a certain percentage split of houses valued at a specific dollar amount would have to be assumed to be single-family detached and multi-family attached. This procedure would then be applied to every house value in every community. The reliability of such a method would be questionable. To obtain reasonable estimates using this method, a certain amount of minimal information would have to be available about local land values and site-specific development potential. This information is not available at the regional level at this time.

Another option considered was use of the information collected as part of the 1975-76 local development policy survey, which assisted in determining the density of likely new development. This approach too had its technical drawbacks. First, although local policy information was collected from each jurisdiction, the information was aggregated to ABAG's 440-zonal system (each 440 zone is comprised of individual census tracts). As a conseqence, some 440 zones are shared between cities, as well as shared between unincorporated and incorporated areas. Thus projected housing growth in a 440 zone based on local policy is difficult to separate into individual jurisdictions in the case of shared zones.

A second difficulty of using local policy survey information was that the information was at a gross level, in other words not site- or city-specific. Thus densities on specific sites were averaged, and therefore it would be difficult to assign specific densities and consequential housing types to a jurisdiction based on the 440-zone information.

For the reasons cited above, ABAG staff concluded it is unwise to attempt to allocate regional housing need to jurisdictions by structure type. However, it is apparent

that for a variety of reasons houses constructed during the 1980-1985 period will be built at higher densities and as a result will tend to include more multi-family attached houses. Residential building permits issued thus far in the Bay Area in 1981 show that two thirds have been issued for the construction of multi-family attached housing. While this permit data indicates what will likely be a regional trend in the 1980s, to allocate housing production needs to communities by structure type would not be particularly useful because of the general lack of information about land capabilities of specific sites in the Bay Area. Such information is more readily available within each community, and descriptions of the allocation of housing needs by type within a community is more appropriately addressed as part of the preparation of local housing elements.

TABLE III-1
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Alameda	60,420	26,517	27,802	27,590
Albany	14,962	6,855	7,035	6,986
Berkeley	94,343	44,704	46,344	45,949
Emeryville	3,761	2,149	2,434	2,400
Fremont	130,689	44,125	45,486	45,396
Hayward	92,709	34,600	35,870	35,777
Livermore	48,196	16,230	16,637	16,548
Newark	32,126	9,216	9,460	9,460
Oakland	331,320	141,640	151,893**	150,982**
Piedmont	10,498	3,763	3,837	3,822
Pleasanton	35,031	11,317	11,665	11,555
San Leandro	63,603	27,204	28,086	28,002
Union City	39,085	11,925	12,333	12,271
Uninc.	120,596	45,847	47,372	47,183
Total	1,077,339	426,092	444,607	442,293

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

** Census figure adjusted based on City of Oakland data.

TABLE III-2
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Antioch	43,263	15,227	15,937	15,873
Brentwood	4,408	1,532	1,597	1,551
Clayton	4,325	1,329	1,377	1,370
Concord	102,295	38,151	39,489	39,338
El Cerrito	22,686	9,660	9,856	9,826
Hercules	5,963	1,753	1,843	1,843
Lafayette	20,708	7,822	8,077	8,061
Martinez	22,038	8,437	8,844	8,764
Moraga	14,126	4,873	4,986	4,979
Pinole	14,239	4,897	5,067	5,057
Pittsburg	32,947	11,087	11,927	11,820
Pleasant Hill	24,652	9,771	10,140	10,120
Richmond	74,126	28,107	29,082	28,929
San Pablo	19,376	7,948	8,356	8,322
Walnut Creek	52,905	23,387	24,405	24,247
Uninc.	192,352	67,824	71,243	70,360
Total	650,409	241,805	252,226	250,460

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-3
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
MARIN COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Belvedere	2,401	947	993	15,873
Corte Madera	8,063	3,223	3,294	3,269
Fairfax	7,377	3,271	3,453	3,367
Larkspur	10,863	5,420	5,590	5,570
Mill Valley	12,654	5,493	5,636	5,567
Novato	42,833	15,493	15,971	15,893
Ross	2,582	879	893	884
San Anselmo	11,853	5,064	5,234	5,186
San Rafael	43,444	18,757	19,200	19,121
Sausalito	7,090	4,019	4,197	4,151
Tiburon	6,635	2,628	2,702	2,682
Uninc.	59,903	23,789	25,740	24,071
Total	215,699	88,983	92,903	90,712

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-4
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
NAPA COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Calistoga	3,790	1,791	1,964	1,920
Napa	50,252	19,714	20,227	20,057
St. Helena	4,795	2,146	2,247	2,153
Yountville	1,538	771	797	780
Uninc.	32,986	12,202	14,817	13,860
Total	93,361	36,624	40,052	38,770

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-5
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
San Francisco	654,521	298,957	316,609	314,392

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-6
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Atherton	7,302	2,426	2,502	2,484
Belmont	23,905	9,713	9,953	9,914
Brisbane	2,969	1,362	1,405	1,385
Burlingame	25,713	12,356	12,659	12,602
Colma	395	161	166	165
Daly City	77,904	27,072	27,823	27,738
Foster City	23,282	8,828	9,178	9,141
Half Moon Bay	7,280	2,609	2,726	2,674
Hillsborough	10,451	3,392	3,561	3,536
Menlo Park	24,580	10,822	11,108	11,040
Millbrae	19,830	7,582	7,773	7,757
Pacifica	36,732	12,733	13,137	13,115
Portola Valley	3,613	1,239	1,284	1,273
Redwood City	54,326	22,927	23,497	23,395
San Bruno	35,354	13,757	14,658	14,608
San Carlos	24,521	10,123	10,350	10,327
San Mateo	77,057	32,855	34,268	34,155
South San Francisco	49,389	17,534	18,020	17,968
Woodside	15,291	1,853	1,907	1,870
Uninc.	71,458	26,135	27,519	26,831
Total	581,352	225,479	233,494	231,978

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-7
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Campbell	26,902	11,639	11,975	11,939
Cupertino	33,741	12,732	13,118**	13,065
Gilroy	21,457	6,839	7,218	7,182
Los Altos	25,326	9,116	9,314	9,286
Los Altos Hills	7,381	2,369	2,444	2,410
Los Gatos	25,727	10,434	10,863	10,776
Milpitas	37,074	11,336	11,659	11,647
Monte Sereno	3,430	1,119	1,156	1,143
Morgan Hill	16,745	5,232	5,566	5,438
Mountain View	57,993	27,480	28,576	28,462
Palo Alto	53,787	23,041	23,711**	23,592
San Jose	618,831	209,375	216,156**	215,291
Santa Clara	84,820	34,037	34,858	34,788
Saratoga	28,793	9,295	9,543	9,495
Sunnyvale	105,790	42,932	44,021	43,889
Uninc.	119,874	41,543	43,603	42,862
Total	1,267,671	458,519	473,817	471,265

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

** Census figure adjusted based on boundary errors in Census-reported figures.

TABLE III-8
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
SOLANO COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Benicia	15,319	5,737	5,911	5,775
Dixon	7,530	2,426	2,615	2,576
Fairfield	54,673	18,406	18,951	18,799
Rio Vista	3,142	1,285	1,331	1,308
Suisun City	11,087	3,434	3,655	3,615
Vacaville	41,334	14,530	15,358	15,220
Vallejo	77,568	28,969	30,278	30,005
Uninc.	16,301	5,639	6,171	6,011
Total	226,954	80,426	84,270	83,020

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-9
1980 POPULATION AND HOUSING
SONOMA COUNTY

City	Population in Households	Households	Total Housing Units	Estimated Available Housing*
Cloverdale	3,919	1,591	1,656	1,636
Cotati	3,469	1,373	1,437	1,420
Healdsburg	7,183	2,885	2,985	2,909
Petaluma	33,465	12,122	12,540	12,440
Rohnert Park	22,933	8,291	8,761	8,691
Santa Rosa	82,075	33,800	35,164	34,788
Sebastopol	5,406	2,358	2,466	2,404
Sonoma	5,850	2,752	2,883	2,790
Uninc.	129,238	49,351	56,344	50,760
Total	293,538	114,523	124,233	117,838

* Estimated by ABAG based on 1970 Census available stock proportions applied to 1980 Census information.

TABLE III-10
EMPLOYMENT BY COUNTY (1975-1985)
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

County	1975	1980	1985
Alameda	434,331	490,434	528,569
Contra Costa	160,046	195,637	226,164
Marin	58,112	69,800	78,759
Napa	29,475	34,900	38,762
San Francisco	495,479	545,600	602,981
San Mateo	225,152	250,600	279,193
Santa Clara	508,285	682,871	752,619
Solano	51,645	74,800	94,871
Sonoma	77,479	91,800	108,696
Region	2,040,004	2,436,442	2,710,614

Sources: ABAG Projections 79 for 1975; Department of Employment Development for 1980; and ABAG forecasts for 1985.

TABLE III-11
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

County	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Alameda	59.0%	40.0%	1.0%
Contra Costa	74.0	23.0	3.0
Marin	68.0	30.0	2.0
Napa	71.0	20.0	9.0
San Francisco	33.0	67.0	0.0
San Mateo	66.0	33.0	1.0
Santa Clara	65.0	31.0	4.0
Solano	70.0	25.0	5.0
Sonoma	73.0	19.0	8.0
Region	61.0	36.0	3.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-12
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Alameda	43.0%	57.0%	0.0%
Albany	60.0	40.0	0.0
Berkeley	43.0	57.0	0.0
Emeryville	20.0	80.0	0.0
Fremont	75.0	23.0	2.0
Hayward	61.0	33.0	6.0
Livermore	81.0	17.0	2.0
Newark	90.0	10.0	0.0
Oakland	48.0	52.0	0.0
Piedmont	97.0	3.0	0.0
Pleasanton	81.0	15.0	4.0
San Leandro	68.0	29.0	3.0
Union City	74.0	19.0	7.0
Uninc.	74.0	24.0	2.0
Total	59.0	40.0	1.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III- 13
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Antioch	74.0%	24.0%	2.0%
Brentwood	64.0	22.0	14.0
Clayton	96.0	4.0	0.0
Concord	65.0	31.0	4.0
El Cerrito	75.0	24.0	1.0
Hercules	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lafayette	78.0	22.0	2.0
Martinez	76.0	24.0	0.0
Moraga	71.0	29.0	0.0
Pinole	83.0	17.0	0.0
Pittsburg	74.0	21.0	5.0
Pleasant Hill	73.0	26.0	1.0
Richmond	65.0	35.0	0.0
San Pablo	51.0	38.0	11.0
Walnut Creek	68.0	32.0	0.0
Uninc.	84.0	12.0	4.0
Total	74.0	23.0	3.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-14
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
MARIN COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Belvedere	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%
Corte Madera	74.0	26.0	0.0
Fairfax	76.0	24.0	0.0
Larkspur	47.0	51.0	2.0
Novato	72.0	24.0	4.0
Ross	96.0	3.0	1.0
San Anselmo	79.0	21.0	0.0
San Rafael	57.0	41.0	2.0
Sausalito	43.0	57.0	0.0
Tiburon	63.0	37.0	0.0
Uninc.	79.0	19.0	2.0
Total	68.0	30.0	2.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-15
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
NAPA COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Calistoga	50.0%	23.0%	27.0%
Napa	68.0	27.0	5.0
St. Helena	67.0	21.0	12.0
Yountville	46.0	13.0	41.0
Uninc.	82.0	9.0	9.0
Total	71.0	20.0	9.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-16
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
San Francisco	33.0%	67.0%	0.0%

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-17
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Atherton	98.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Belmont	63.0	37.0	0.0
Brisbane	64.0	31.0	5.0
Burlingame	53.0	47.0	0.0
Colma	83.0	16.0	1.0
Daly City	66.0	32.0	2.0
Foster City	63.0	37.0	0.0
Half Moon Bay	75.0	11.0	14.0
Hillsborough	99.0	1.0	0.0
Menlo Park	61.0	39.0	0.0
Millbrae	71.0	29.0	0.0
Pacifica	78.0	21.0	1.0
Portola Valley	98.0	2.0	0.0
Redwood City	57.0	41.0	2.0
San Bruno	65.0	35.0	0.0
San Carlos	74.0	26.0	0.0
San Mateo	55.0	45.0	0.0
South San Francisco	67.0	31.0	2.0
Woodside	98.0	2.0	0.0
Uninc.	74.0	22.0	4.0
Total	66.0	33.0	1.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-18
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Campbell	50.0%	46.0%	4.0%
Cupertino	70.0	30.0	0.0
Gilroy	65.0	30.0	5.0
Los Altos	89.0	11.0	0.0
Los Altos Hills	97.0	3.0	0.0
Los Gatos	71.0	28.0	1.1
Milpitas	75.0	20.0	5.0
Monte Sereno	99.0	1.0	0.0
Morgan Hill	71.0	16.0	13.0
Mountain View	32.0	64.0	4.0
Palo Alto	65.0	35.0	0.0
San Jose	67.0	29.0	4.0
Santa Clara	52.0	47.0	1.0
Saratoga	96.0	4.0	0.0
Sunnyvale	49.0	42.0	9.0
Uninc.	80.0	16.0	4.0
Total	65.0	31.0	4.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-19
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
SOLANO COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Benicia	69.0%	26.0%	5.0%
Dixon	82.0	17.0	1.0
Fairfield	66.0	29.0	5.0
Rio Vista	76.0	18.0	6.0
Suisun City	73.0	25.0	2.0
Vacaville	72.0	20.0	8.0
Vallejo	68.0	28.0	4.0
Uninc.	87.0	5.0	8.0
Total	70.0	25.0	5.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-20
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 HOUSING BY TYPE
SONOMA COUNTY

City	Single-Family Detached	Multi-Family Attached	Mobilehomes
Cloverdale	71.0%	20.0%	9.0%
Cotati	55.0	36.0	9.0
Healdsburg	76.0	22.0	2.0
Petaluma	79.0	15.0	6.0
Rohnert Park	53.0	30.0	17.0
Santa Rosa	64.0	30.0	6.0
Sebastopol	69.0	27.0	4.0
Sonoma	61.0	26.0	13.0
Uninc.	82.0	8.0	10.0
Total	73.0	19.0	8.0

Source: ABAG estimates

TABLE III-21
1980 FARMWORKER EMPLOYMENT BY COUNTY
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

County	Percent of Total Labor Force
Alameda	0.4%
Contra Costa	0.4
Marin	---
Napa	8.3
San Francisco	---
San Mateo	0.8
Santa Clara	0.6
Solano	2.6
Sonoma	4.3
Region	0.7

Source: Employment Development Department Annual Survey, 1980.

TABLE III-22
REPLACEMENT NEEDS
STATEWIDE HOUSING PLAN ESTIMATES
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

County	Removal Rate Assumed in State Plan	Estimated Replacement Need
Alameda	0.6%	10,900
Contra Costa	0.6	7,700
Marin	0.5	2,200
Napa	0.4	1,800
San Francisco	0.7	15,000
San Mateo	0.6	2,000
Santa Clara	0.4	14,000
Solano	1.0	3,500
Sonoma	0.5	5,600
Region Total		62,700

Sources:

California Statewide Housing Plan, 1977, Department of Housing and Community Development, Appendix C, p. 76, for removal rates.

California Statewide Housing Plan, 1979 Update, Department of Housing and Community Development, Table 4-3, p. 114, for replacement estimates as of July 1978.

TABLE III-23
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Alameda	8.5%	839	677	818
Albany	2.3	227	183	207
Berkeley	19.5	1,924	1,554	1,362
Emeryville	0.6	59	48	71
Fremont	0.9	89	72	1,346
Hayward	1.7	168	135	1,061
Livermore	0.6	59	48	491
Newark	0.2	20	16	280
Oakland	56.4	5,566	4,493	4,475
Piedmont	1.9	187	151	113
Pleasanton	0.3	30	24	343
San Leandro	3.2	316	255	830
Union City	0.4	39	32	363
Unincorporated	3.4	345	279	1,350
Total	100.0	9,868	7,967	13,110

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.6% annually.

TABLE III-24
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Antioch	5.8%	64	169	471
Brentwood	1.2	13	35	46
Clayton*****	1.9	24	55	41
Concord	3.5	39	102	1,166
El Cerrito	6.4	71	187	291
Hercules*****	0.05	6	15	55
Lafayette	2.2	24	64	239
Martinez	7.7	85	225	260
Moraga	0.2	2	6	148
Pinole	1.4	15	41	149
Pittsburg	8.4	93	245	350
Pleasant Hill	1.1	12	32	300
Richmond	25.7	284	751	858

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.6% annually.

***** The percentage of older stock is estimated based on the county ratio of older stock to total stock times the total stock of the city.

TABLE III-24 (continued)
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
San Pablo	4.1	45	120	246
Walnut Creek	1.9	21	55	718
Unincorporated	28.5	309	819	2,086
Total	100.0	1,104	2,921	7,424

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.
** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.
*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.
**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.6% annually.

TABLE III-25
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
MARIN COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Belvedere	1.6%	9	6	24
Corte Madera	3.2	19	13	81
Fairfax	7.8	46	30	83
Larkspur	4.1	24	16	138
Mill Valley	12.2	71	48	138
Novato	3.2	19	13	393
Ross	3.6	21	14	22
San Anselmo	12.0	70	47	128
San Rafael	16.6	103	69	473
Sausalito	9.4	55	37	103
Tiburon	1.4	8	6	66
Unincorporated	3.4	140	95	596
Total	100.0	585	394	2,245

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.5% annually.

TABLE III-26
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
NAPA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Calistoga*****	4.1	7	12	38
Napa	42.0	70	121	398
St. Helena	8.9	15	26	43
Yountville*****	1.4	2	4	15
Unincorporated	49.1	81	141	275
Total	100.0	166	288	769

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.4% annually.

***** The percentage of older stock is estimated based on the county ratio of older stock to total stock times the total stock of the city.

TABLE III-27
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
San Francisco	100.0%	13,990	5,462	10,851

* Since San Francisco is both a city and a county, all its housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data, shows up in this column.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.7% annually.

TABLE III-28
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Atherton	2.1%	4	34	74
Belmont	1.6	3	26	294
Brisbane	1.6	3	26	41
Burlingame	16.4	32	267	374
Colma*****	0.09	0	1	5
Daly City	9.6	19	154	822
Foster City	0.0	0	0	271
Half Moon Bay	0.6	1	10	79
Hillsborough	2.0	4	32	105
Menlo Park	4.3	8	69	327
Millbrae	2.4	5	39	230
Pacifica	1.1	2	18	389
Portola Valley	0.9	2	14	38

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.6% annually.

***** The percentage of older stock is estimated based on the county ratio of older stock to total stock times the total stock of the city.

TABLE III-29
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SAN MATEO COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Redwood City	10.9	21	175	693
San Bruno	5.5	11	88	433
San Carlos	3.6	7	58	306
San Mateo	17.5	34	281	1,012
South San Francisco	6.8	13	109	533
Woodside	1.4	3	22	55
Unincorporated	11.4	43	184	795
Total	100.0	196	1,607	6,876

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.6% annually.

TABLE III-30
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Campbell	1.4%	26	29	237
Cupertino	0.4	7	8	259
Gilroy	2.2	41	46	142
Los Altos	1.8	33	38	184
Los Altos Hills	0.6	11	13	48
Los Gatos	4.1	76	86	214
Milpitas	0.3	6	6	231
Monte Sereno	0.6	11	13	23
Morgan Hill	1.1	20	23	108
Mountain View	3.5	65	73	565
Palo Alto	12.6	234	263	468
San Jose	46.6	867	972	4,272

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.4% annually.

TABLE III-30 (continued)
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Santa Clara	4.3	80	90	690
Saratoga	1.5	28	31	188
Sunnyvale	2.8	52	58	871
Unincorporated	16.2	304	337	850
Total	100.0	1,861	2,086	9,350

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.4% annually.

TABLE III-31
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SOLANO COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Benicia	7.1%	78	76	283
Dixon	3.4	37	36	126
Fairfield	3.3	36	35	921
Rio Vista	3.4	37	36	64
Suisun City	1.2	13	13	177
Vacaville	3.7	40	40	746
Vallejo	27.8	304	298	1,471
Unincorporated	50.2	548	537	281
Total	100.0	1,093	1,071	4,069

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 1.0% annually.

TABLE III-32
1985 REPLACEMENT NEED
SONOMA COUNTY

City	% Older Stock*	HAP Replacement Estimates**	RHP Replacement Estimates***	Modified State Method****
Cloverdale	1.5%	114	18	40
Cotati*****	0.6	46	7	35
Healdsburg	4.2	320	51	72
Petaluma	12.6	959	152	308
Rohnert Park*****	2.3	175	28	215
Santa Rosa	21.1	1,605	255	861
Sebastopol	3.6	274	43	60
Sonoma	2.4	183	29	69
Unincorporated	51.8	3,933	625	1,257
Total	100.0	7,609	1,208	2,917

* Fraction of county housing stock estimated as 30 or more years old, based on 1970 Census data.

** Calculated by ABAG based on information obtained from the 1976-1977 Housing Assistance Plans of Bay Area cities and counties.

*** Calculated by ABAG based on replacement estimates used in the 1978 ABAG Regional Housing Plan.

**** Calculated by ABAG based on 1977 Statewide Housing Plan removal rate of 0.5% annually.

***** The percentage of older stock is estimated based on the county ratio of older stock to total stock times the total stock of the city.

APPENDIX IV. BACKGROUND PAPER ON RELATED REGIONAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

The housing needs determinations presented in this report should be carefully considered by local governments in the total context of ABAG's housing program. While the origins of these determinations rests in provisions of State law, ABAG does not intend that the numbers stand alone with no relationship to the agency's housing activities and other ABAG programs such as its projections and economic development work.

ABAG's Regional Housing Plan was adopted by the Executive Board in January 1978. The plan outlined four broad objectives:

- To increase the housing supply in accordance with the region's needs.
- To maintain and improve existing housing so that it can better fill the region's needs.
- To expand and conserve housing opportunities for lower income people
- To eliminate all forms of illegal or arbitrary discrimination from the housing market.

As a basis for implementing these objectives and the policies contained in the Regional Housing Plan, quantified goals for housing construction, rehabilitation and assistance were prepared for the period 1975 to 1985. These quantified goals--accepted by the Executive Board--also provided a regional context for the development and adoption of local policies and programs. In order that the regional housing needs figures in this report be presented in their proper perspective, it is important to distinguish them from the earlier quantified goals.

The regional housing need determinations contained in this report are numbers that identify the housing needs of every community in the Bay Area. The quantified goals contained in the Regional Housing Plan were county-level targets that expressed a regional perspective on housing needs. The quantified goals were developed with the knowledge that the target figures might differ from the housing needs estimates of other agencies, including local governments. These differences could be attributed to differing assumptions and purposes. In addition, the quantified goals did not take into consideration differing

local circumstances such as vacancy rates (a universal 5% vacancy rate was applied to all counties), or market demand for housing, especially the effects of financing on housing affordability.

Since the Regional Housing Plan was adopted, ABAG's housing program has been addressing the plan's four objectives. The activities are aimed at aiding and assisting in the construction of affordable housing for all Bay Area residents, with special concern for residents of low and moderate incomes. Providing housing that is affordable to people of low and moderate incomes is a formidable challenge given the need for public assistance and programs geared to this special housing need. However, as the housing crisis increases in its severity, a growing number of middle-income people are unable to find affordable housing.

ABAG's Housing Program Activities

The following is a brief description of ABAG's housing analyses and programs since adoption of the Regional Housing Plan:

Manufactured Housing Study. The first phase of this study was completed in November 1980. The report was aimed at investigating the use of manufactured housing as a potentially affordable housing alternative. Preparation of the report was guided by a task force of representatives of the manufactured housing industry, planners, building inspectors, county assessors, bankers, non-profit housing staff and others. The second phase of the study, to be completed in mid-1982, deals with many issues not resolved in the first report, such as the foundation systems best addressing seismic safety considerations, and local government responses to State legislation limiting local governments' regulatory powers over use of manufactured housing in residential areas.

Development Fees Survey. The survey was first done in October 1979. It had two purposes: to assess the differences in development-related fees for new residential and commercial construction in the Bay Area, and to provide information that woul enable local decision-makers to evaluate their own development fees after comparisons with those of other jurisdictions in the region. This survey is currently being updated and will be reissued in early 1982.

Surplus Lands Study. This report, complete with an inventory of publicly owned surplus properties, was completed in January 1981. The intent of the study was to

identify potential sites for the development of low- and moderate-income housing. The study accomplished this not only by identifying sites, but also by identifying some of the major policy and procedural issues involved, and suggesting ways to overcome these obstacles. An update of this study will be completed in mid-1982.

Housing Activity Report. Three editions of this report have been completed, the latest in May 1981. The report highlights the number of residential building permits issued by county and market area for the period 1976 to 1980. The report also include information on mobile homes and condominium conversions. The report reflects what has already occurred in the region, and is meant for those concerned with the rate of residential construction. The next edition of the report is scheduled for May 1982.

Local Officials' Guide to Housing and Housing Programs. This guide describes public and private housing programs, and is intended to offer potential solutions to commonly recognized housing issues. The information contained in this report is derived from a wide range of sources, with a special emphasis on tried and proven solutions. The report was completed in September 1980, and is scheduled for revision in late 1982.

Inclusionary Land Use Measures Report. Sections of this report were published from April 1979 to March 1980, with the full report issued in June 1980. The report investigates the obstacles and and opportunities that exist to getting much-needed low- and moderate-income housing constructed. The report identifies what various Bay Area and other California cities and counties are doing to provide additional affordable housing opportunities. The report underscores the need for public-private cooperation in the acceptance, financing and construction of low- and moderate-income housing.

Directory of Assisted Housing. First published in 1977, with updates occurring in 1979 and 1981, this directory identifies the names, address, size, and type of assisted housing developments by jurisidiction. The directory also lists local housing authorities' names and addresses. The publication is intended to assist low- and moderate-income people find available housing. An update of the report is scheduled for May 1982.

Regional Housing Mobility Program. This is a national demonstration program. Participants include ABAG, the county housing authorities of Alameda, Contra Costa and Santa Clara, and several fair housing agencies: Midpeninsula Citizens for Fair Housing, Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity, Housing Alliance of Contra Costa,

Pacific Community Services and the Bay Area Urban League. The program has improved the housing choices of low-income people receiving rental assistance under the Section 8 program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Key components of this progra have included working with real estate brokers, property managers and owners to inform them of the Section 8 program and its advantages, publishing a jobs/housing/social services directory for the three counties, and publication of informational services for landlords.

In addition to the activities listed above, the ABAG housing program has sponsored a number of workshops covering such topics as financing, energy efficiency and cooperative housing. The program staff continues to work closely with local government staff by sponsoring van tours of assisted housing and manufacturered housing to improve understanding of these techniques of providing affordable housing.

With the private sector, ABAG has coordinated a van tour of manufactured housing plants and subdivisions for a number of savings and loan institutions and the Federal Home Loan Bank. In addition, ABAG has worked with housing bond counsels and has supported local government efforts to sell tax-exempt mortgage bonds. ABAG's housing staff continue to assist non-profit housing development corporations in their individual and collective efforts to build housing for low-, moderate- and middle-income people.

Finally, the housing program staff are researching the economics of rental housing, the potential of mixed land use developments, use of air rights and ground leases, and other subjects to assist Bay Area communities in achieving the housing need goals identified in this report.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C124892851